National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service

Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

NL-339 (r. 88/04) c

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

PEACE EDUCATION: HOW DID WE GET IT AND WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

BY

JOE CLOUTIER ©

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF MASTER OF EDUCATION
IN PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATIONS

EDMONTON, ALBERTA
(SPRING, 1990)

National Library of Canada
Canadian Theses Service

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Service des thèses canadiennes

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

ISBN 0-315-60360-7

NL-339 (r. 88/04) c

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: JOE CLOUTIER

TITLE OF THESIS: PEACE EDUCATION: HOW DID WE GET IT AND WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

DEGREE: MASTER OF EDUCATION

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: 1990

PERMISSION IS HEREBY GRANTED TO THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY TO REPRODUCE SINGLE COPIES OF THIS THESIS AND TO LEND OR SELL SUCH COPIES FOR PRIVATE, SCHOLARLY OR SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH PURPOSES ONLY.

THE AUTHOR RESERVES OTHER PUBLICATION RIGHTS, AND NEITHER THE THESIS NOR EXTENSIVE EXTRACTS FROM IT MAY BE PRINTED OR OTHERWISE REPRODUCED WITHOUT THE AUTHOR'S WRITTEN PERMISSION.

J Cloutier

9547 - 98A Avenue

Edmonton, Alberta

T6C 2E5

Date: April 24/1990

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

THE UNDERSIGNED CERTIFY THAT THEY HAVE READ, AND RECOMMEND TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH FOR ACCEPTANCE, A THESIS ENTITLED PEACE EDUCATION: HOW DID WE GET IT AND WHAT DOES IT MEAN? SUBMITTED BY JOE CLOUTIER IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF EDUCATION.

F. N. Walker

Dr. Foster N. Walker

Eamonn Callan

Dr. Eamonn Callan

Bruce Hunter

Dr. Bruce Hunter

Dr. Terrence R. Carson

Date: April 24, 1990

DEDICATION

To Jody

who helped me more than he knows

ABSTRACT

The title of this thesis, Peace Education: How Did We Get It and What Does It Mean?, is not intended to imply that peace education is something that one gets nor that there is a single definition of peace or peace education. To define "peace" or "peace education" in this way is to suggest that they are static concepts from which we can draw logical conclusions. Rather, I argue that what one means by the term "peace education" is determined by one's conception of peace. In the first three chapters I trace this conception, historically, through three major paradigms of peace-making. From within these paradigms--peace from the inside out, paradigm one; peace from the top down, paradigm two; and peace from the bottom up, paradigm three--people have worked for peace in different ways.

In Chapter I, I present a brief outline of the salient features of each paradigm. Chapter II offers a historical overview in which examples from history are used to illustrate the three paradigms of peace-making. In Chapter III, the focus is on attempts at defining peace. However one views peace, there is a subtle problem at deciding conclusively on a single definition. Peace, it is argued, is a living experience that is realized through its pursuit.

Chapter IV marks the emergence of contemporary conceptions of peace education. These conceptions and their underlying assumptions are explored and discussed. The balance of the chapter investigates a variety of perspectives about peace education. Essential elements of these perspectives are then compared in order to identify unifying characteristics.

The focus of Chapter V is the content and form of peace education. In this chapter, the relation between content and form is delved into and expanded upon. It is this relationship that transforms peace education into education for peace.

Chapter VI examines some of the criticism that the growth of peace education programs has drawn.

Finally Chapter VII, the summary and conclusions, reviews the evolution in peace thinking that has marked the emergence of peace education as it is understood today.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to acknowledge the support of my committee members--Dr. Eammon Callan, Dr. Terry Carson, and Dr. Bruce Hunter. Their comments and suggestions provided direction and encouraged reflection.

To my thesis supervisor, Dr. Foster Walker, I extend a heartfelt thank you for allowing me the freedom to find my own way through this project and for balancing that freedom with critical comments and valuable suggestions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

I INTRODUCTION

The Dialogue Begins 1

The Issues of Peace Education 3

Paradigm One: Peace From the Inside Out 4

Paradigm Two: Peace From the Top Down 6

Paradigm Three: Peace From the Bottom Up 6

Endnotes 9

II HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

Introduction 10

The Quaker Influence: Peace From the Inside Out 10

Immanuel Kant and "Perpetual Peace": Peace From the Top Down 14

Other Approaches to Peace and Peace Education 21

Peace Through Social Revolution: Karl Marx 21

Peace Movements and Peace Education in America 28

Peace Making and International Education 34

Paradigm Three: Peace From the Bottom Up 39

Endnotes 43

III PEACE: ATTEMPTS AND PROBLEMS WITH DEFINITION

Introduction 47

Peace and Liberation Theology 47

Paradigm One: Peace From the Inside Out 54

Paradigm Two: Peace From the Top Down
(Peace Through Strength) 55
Paradigm Three: Peace From the Bottom Up 60
Peace Building 61
Peace Action 62
Social Justice 63
Environmental Care 64
Cultural Solidarity 65
Endnotes 68

IV PEACE EDUCATION: A CONTRAST OF PERSPECTIVES

Introduction 72
The Dimensions of Peace Education:
From America 75
The Dimensions of Peace Education:
From Great Britain 77
The Dimensions of Peace Education:
From The Philippines 78
The Dimensions of Peace Education:
From Canada 83
Endnotes 87

V PEACE EDUCATION: THE CONTENT AND THE FORM

Introduction 90
Peace Education: The Content 90
Peace Education: The Form 92
Endnotes 105

VI PEACE EDUCATION: SOME CRITICAL PERSPECTIVES

Introduction 108

From Canada 108

From Great Britain 114

From Australia 115

Endnotes 123

VII SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction 126

The Dialogue Continues 130

Endnotes 148

BIBLIOGRAPHY 149

APPENDIX 1 155

APPENDIX 2 157

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1: Perspectives on Peace Education 85

TABLE 2: Peace: Paradigm Three Core Values and Peace Education:
Values and Dimensions 85

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

The Dialogue Begins

This thesis begins with a short dialogue which takes place in a peace studies course at a large university. The characters are Professor Simpson, a well-known proponent of peace studies, and John, one of Professor Simpson's students.

John is interested in philosophy and is now in his final year of a B.Ed. program. John has recently discovered peace education. He wants to learn more and has registered in a peace studies course offered by Professor Simpson. The dialogue begins in Professor Simpson's office following the first class:

John:

Thank you for taking the time to see me, Professor. I find the concept of peace education confusing and would like to have a clearer understanding of the field. Can you suggest a way that I might begin?

Professor Simpson:

Well, you might try the assigned readings.

John:

I have. I got the reading list early and read everything I could over the summer. I am still confused, although I am not able to express my confusion in the form of clear questions.

Professor Simpson:

Well...., John, I wish all students would approach their courses in that way. I can suggest some further reading for you. One of my graduate students has just completed a thesis on peace education. I have an extra copy. Why don't you take it home and read the thesis over the next few weeks? If you like, make an appointment with me when you are finished and we will discuss your questions at that time.

John:

I would like that very much.

Professor Simpson:

Enjoy your reading, John.

John leaves the professor's office, convinced that he is on the way to sorting out his confusion. Once at home, he begins to read the thesis....

The Issues of Peace Education

Humanity is confronting disaster on many fronts. The urgent need for change prompted the members of the World Commission on Environment and Development to formulate a "global agenda for change" for the General Assembly of the United Nations. They point out that:

> Until recently the planet was a large world in which human activities and their effects were neatly compartmentalized within nations, within sectors (energy, agriculture, trade) and within broad areas of concern (environmental, economic, social). These compartments have begun to dissolve . . . . They are not separate crises: an environmental crisis, a developmental crisis, they are all one.[1]

The issues of peace education--militarization, structural violence, human rights, cultural solidarity, environmental care, and personal peace[2]--like the issues faced by the World Commission on Environment and Development, are in reality all one. They stem from our world view and are reflected in our attitudes and values. It is the task of peace education to question many of the underlying assumptions that create our world view and through that enquiry, discover how the issues of peace education might be caused by the way we view the world. But before we explore those issues, it will be useful to trace the vision of peace through three major paradigms. Paradigm here refers to a distinctive set of assumptions that determine one's approach to and understanding of peace. From within these paradigms, people have worked for peace in different ways. What follows is a brief outline of the salient features of each paradigm.

Paradigm One: Peace From the Inside Out

First, there is the notion of personal peace. This concern for inner peace is characteristic of many religious traditions. The search for inner peace, however, must not end with a blissful sense of enlightenment. It must focus on eradicating the structures of inequality that are responsible for the oppression of the many for the benefit of the few. Peace, from within this paradigm, integrates personal peace with social action. The sense of social responsibility that underlies this view is reinforced by values such as justice, equity, and a fundamental respect for human dignity.

The concern for inner peace or, in Platonic terms a harmonious soul, echoes throughout history. In Plato's Republic, for example, Socrates, in dialogue with Glaucon, points out that justice "does not lie in man's external actions, but in the way he acts within himself." Unjust action, for Socrates, destroys this sense of inner harmony in the person and, as a result, the harmony of the city.[3] The city's unity is dissolved "when some suffer greatly while others greatly rejoice . . . ."[4]

For the early Christians, inner peace meant becoming aware of the Christ within, transforming violence into love and returning good for evil. This period of "moral regeneration"[5] (29-313 AD) was marked by a Christian embrace of uncompromising pacifism. Thus in the era before the fall of Rome, Christians rejected all forms of war and violence.[6] The Christian embodiment of strict pacifism lasted approximately three centuries. Then, in the fourth century, the transformation of Christian martyrs into Christian soldiers accompanied Emperor Constantine's integration of the temporal power of Rome with the spiritual power of Christianity.

In the medieval church, "moral regeneration" became "moral rearmament"[7] and war was justified as a tool of politics. Now, "Godly men could kill others in wars if their cause is righteous and they fight in moral ways." St. Augustine

(354-430 AD) understood the Christian desire to live in peace, but he also acknowledged that it could be with the desire for peace that wars are fought.[8] To protect the peace, Augustine recognized four classes of citizens who each had a function and responsibility in relation to war:

> The emperor alone declares war; the soldier engages in battle; the private citizen may not take a human life even in self-defence; and the clergy are prohibited from involvement in combat.[9]

Thus, for Augustine, involvement in military life was a duty. Human relations in this world are poisoned by evil; therefore, it may be justifiable to wage war--under certain conditions--against evil. War was just if soldiers did not plunder, when it was waged to protect the peace, and if one could prove the legitimacy of his claim.[10]

The theory of the "just war" has served the purposes of warring states throughout history. With the waning of early Christian pacifism, the notion of peace from the inside out was dominated by the responsibility to obey the commands of the sovereign (peace from the top down). But if, in following the commands of the emperor, one becomes involved in an unjust war, there is no blame. Augustine writes, "The soldier is innocent because his position makes obedience a duty."[11] But the Christian church, like the Christian state, has been exposed to the temptation of power. The struggles between church and state led to the wars of religion that dominated the era of the reformation. The Quakers or Society of Friends emerged out of the Reformation and marked a return to pacifism and a sense of peace that not only worked from the inside out but was realized through social reform.

For the Quakers, peace hinged on the notion that "all war was incompatible with reason and morality."[12] Peace for the Quakers worked from the inside out. This sense of peace is characteristic of later movements for social reform, movements such as the social gospel or the social justice impulse of contemporary churches.

Paradigm Two: Peace from the Top Down

Peace, from within the second paradigm, works from the top down. In this view peace is legislated and realized through the authority of law. Thus political methods and international agreements, in this view, hold the hope for a peaceful world. The dominance of this approach to peace has set the tone of national and international relations for more than three centuries. Recommendations and plans for an international league to maintain peace can be found in the political writings of abbe de Saint-Pierre (1713), Jean Jacques Rousseau (1756), Immanuel Kant (1795), and many earlier authors. This paradigm of peacemaking resulted in the international activity intended to prevent World War I, the establishment of the League of Nations (1919), the Kellogg-Briand Pact to abolish war (1928), and the creation of the United Nations (1945). The evolution and diverse activities of the United Nations encompass a much broader view of peace than was considered in previous proposals. To trace this evolution, while acknowledging the work of earlier writers such as Saint-Pierre and Rousseau, I will focus on Immanuel Kant's essay "Perpetual Peace."

Paradigm Three: Peace from the Bottom Up

Peace, from within the third paradigm, begins with the actions of the people, the grass roots. It is reinforced by a sense of personal peace, national, and international law. The work of Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King provide examples of this approach to peace. King's non-violent social action inspired civil rights demonstrations and legislation that tore at the social fabric of America during the 1960's and 1970's. The turmoil of this movement was matched by the massive demonstrations of American citizens demanding an end to the Vietnam War. Actions from within this paradigm have given a fresh quality to the struggle for peace throughout the world. This view of peace represents a realization that each one of us has a part to play in creating a more peaceful world. Peace, in this view, is concerned with more than the mere absence of war. This all-encompassing view of peace is reflected in the issues of peace education. Peace-makers from within this paradigm focus their attention on militarization, structural violence, human rights, cultural solidarity, environmental care, and personal peace. This third paradigm does not represent a negation of other perspectives on peace, perspectives that saw peace working from the inside out. Nor does it deny the legitimacy of peace working from the top down through legislation.

What this view of peace represents is a realization that the actions of ordinary people are an important component in the elimination of structures of violence locally, nationally, and globally. This also is an acknowledgement that peace cannot be realized for some and result in the suffering of others. Peace is a social concern and peace-makers working from within this paradigm must question problems of direct and structural violence. This enquiry leads one quite naturally to questions concerning personal peace, social justice, and human rights. But how has this conception of peace come about and how is it related to peace education? In what follows I will explore those questions historically and from a Western perspective.

To begin this historical overview and to illustrate the first two paradigms of peace making, I have focused on the work of the Quakers (to explore the first paradigm) and the work of the philosopher Immanuel Kant (to introduce the second paradigm). The Quakers provide us with an insight into the notion of personal peace--that is peace working from the inside out and made manifest in social reform. Kant's essay "Perpetual Peace" is written in the form of a peace treaty, and Kant's work provides an example of proposals for peace that see peace as working from the top down. ("Perpetual Peace," published in 1795, provided an early vision of the League of Nations.)

In focusing on the Quakers and the work of Kant, I have skimmed over the contributions of many other groups and individuals. Karl Marx, for example, deserves much more space than I have given him. Marxist thought could be analyzed in the context of Third World development and in the emergence of Liberation Theology; however, space will not permit such worthwhile explorations.

The third paradigm of peace-making encompasses the notion that peace works from the bottom up, from the grass roots, and through the processes of "conscientization" and empowerment. Conscientization is here understood to describe a process whereby people, through reflecting on experience and the development of critical awareness, are able to become active subjects capable of participating in and acting on the world. Empowerment is linked to conscientization and describes an educational process whereby students are encouraged to act creatively to improve the social reality. This paradigm begins with the people, but it is more than that: it is an extension of paradigms one and two. To illustrate this paradigm in action and to mark its emergence in the late 1950's, I have focused on the civil rights movement and the anti-war protests of the Vietnam era. The emergence of Liberation Theology is touched upon and identified as part of the third paradigm. Now I will return to the historical overview.

Chapter I Endnotes

[1] World Commission on Environment and Development, Our Common Future (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), p. 3.

[2] S. H. Toh and V. Floresca-Cawagas, Peace Education (Quezon City: Phoenix Press, 1987), pp. 5-28.

[3] Plato, Plato's Republic, trans. G. M. A. Grube (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 1986), p. 443d.

[4] Ibid., p. 442c.

[5] F. H. Hinsley, Power and the Pursuit of Peace (Cambridge, MA: University Press, 1963), p. 2.

[6] P. Brock, Pacifism in the United States (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968), pp. 3-24.

[7] Hinsley, p. 2.

[8] St. Augustine, "The City of God," in Great Political Thinkers, ed. W. Ebenstein (Santa Barbara: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969), p. 182.

[9] V. J. Genovesia, S.J., "The Just War Doctrine and Resistance," The Thomist, 45, No. 3, (1981), p. 506.

[10] St. Augustine, De civ. Dei, IV, in J. Kondziela, "Catholic Perspective on Life in Peace," Bulletin of Peace Proposals, 18, No. 3 (1987), p. 415.

[11] Genovesia, p. 507.

[12] Hinsley, p. 16.

CHAPTER II: HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

Introduction

The historical overview is intended to provide examples from history that trace and illustrate the paradigms of peace-making. The first two paradigms have deep historical roots, while the third is a more recent phenomenon. It is helpful to be aware of this evolution in peace thinking in order that one may better come to terms with contemporary conceptions of peace and peace education.

The Quaker Influence: Peace from the Inside Out

The Quaker embrace of pacifism became part of their tradition in 1661 when they abandoned the notion of fighting even for a righteous cause. From 1661 forward, the Quaker peace testimony rejected taking up arms "either on behalf of an earthly kingdom or to inaugurate the kingdom of Christ."[1] In 1681, England's Charles II issued a charter to William Penn for a "Holy Experiment." The experiment created a colony (Pennsylvania) which was governed consistent with Quaker principles. Pacifism for the early Quakers meant peace, order, and self-determination. The concept of peace included personal or inner peace reinforced through social action. The principle of self-determination was reflected in Quaker relations with the natives, and their relations were marked by the absence of violence and a recognition that the great spirit shines an inner light for all people.[2] The light shone bright and,

> Pennsylvania became a beacon of hope for all who shared the Quakers' belief in equality and human dignity; the relations of the commonwealth with the Indians redeemed in some small measure the many atrocities otherwise visited on the Native Americans . . . .[3]

But the political light grew dim, and through the principle of religious tolerance and continued immigration, the Quakers became a minority in Pennsylvania.

Their influence began to wane after 1756 when Quaker legislators refused to support military operations against the French and Indians.

The Quaker road was not always a smooth one nor without its detours. Quakers suffered persecution in seventeenth-century England and in "1682 alone twenty-three ships carried over two thousand people to Pennsylvania."[4] As a result of the Glorious Revolution (1688) and the Toleration Act (1689), religious persecution in England was slowly brought to a halt. Early Quakers (1652-1657) felt a need to spread the word and share the peace that they had found. They made journeys of conversion throughout Europe and Colonial America where they met with much resistance. They were accused of witchcraft, jailed, and in some cases expelled from the colonies.[5]

But time did its work. The Quaker urge to convert subsided, and soon they were no longer thought of as witches. Quakers became involved in the business and politics of the American colonies. This involvement sometimes led to a compromise of Quaker principles. Consider, for example, the case of Quaker politician John Wanton. In 1737 he succeeded his brother as Governor of Rhode Island. In his position as Governor, he compromised the Quaker peace testimony by taking part in military activities. Wanton was subsequently excluded from attending Quaker monthly meetings.[6] Quakers were not all saints. The Society of Friends was made up of ordinary humans with ordinary human failings. But all members were expected to show an example of non-violence in their daily lives.

> Quaker pacifists at their best, whether in America or in Europe, bore witness to their beliefs in both a negative and positive fashion--in the one case by an uncompromising refusal to meet the military demands of Caesar and, in the other, by an outflow of love for their fellowmen, whether heathen Indians or Christians belonging to "enemy" nations.[7]

As the Quaker society evolved, Friends related their protests against war and their refusal to resist attack by violence "to shortcomings in the existing political and social order, in particular to the evil of slavery and to inequalities in wealth."[8]

Wealth, many Quakers believed, was a trust with which a person is endowed by God and it must be used to forward God's purpose. The self-centered act of amassing riches is wrong, Quaker John Woolman argued in his essay "A Plea for the Poor." He wrote,

> Wealth is attended with power, by which bargains and proceedings contrary to universal righteousness are supported; and here oppression carried on with worldly policy and order, clothes itself with the name of justice, and becomes like a seed of discord in the soul: and as the spirit which wanders from the pure habitation prevails, so the seed of war swells and sprouts and grows and becomes strong until much fruit are ripened.[9]

But as previously pointed out, not all Quakers heard the call. For some, the temptation of riches and political authority compromised their noble urges.

Other Friends' sense of inner peace was focused outward on social reform. Slavery was a major social problem in eighteenth-century America. The first official Quaker proposal for abolition came in 1769. It was pointed out that slavery was brutal and recommended that Friends free all slaves except the very old and the very young. "By the time of the revolutionary war slavery had virtually ceased to exist in New England."[10] Once they rid themselves of the blight of slavery, Friends worked with other anti-slavery groups to obtain a national prohibition on the trade.[11]

In 1770, Quakers opened the first school for freed blacks in North America.[12] During the war for American Independence, Friends provided aid to non-combatants on either side. As one observer pointed out,

> Whatever prejudiced or misinformed writers may say, the truth . . . is that the majority of Quakers did not favor more one side than the other, and that they helped anyone who needed help, no matter who he was. If a few Quakers did serve in the English army, a few . . . also served in the American army, and the Society expelled indiscriminately all who bore arms.[13]

Quaker reformer Anthony Benezet made an early contribution to peace research with his pacifist treatises Thoughts on the Nature of War. In his treatises, he condemned war as "the premeditated and determined destruction of human beings." Quaker peace testimony included the explicit refusal to participate in war. The act of war, Benezet stated, was too evil to originate from God and too destructive to remain the sole concern of the traditional peace sects. Benezet took his message to the society at large; love, he proclaimed, is the divine thread that will repair the wounds of war and unite all people. But Benezet's message could not halt the march of war.[14]

In America, as the Civil War approached, reform movements and pacifists' movements focused on the abolition of slavery and, among other things, created the Underground Railroad. The Underground Railroad was an "informal network of safe houses and people who helped fugitives pass from slave states in the United States to free states or to Canada."[15]

Quakers were active in the underground railroad and in other movements for social reform. For these Quakers, inner peace came from a recognition of the inner light of God which shone for everyone. But recognition of this light was not enough for Quaker peace testimony. This sense of inner peace is incomplete without a concern for the suffering of others and a commitment to take action for social reform. Thus peace for the Quakers worked from the inside out.

Pacifism waxed and waned with the social turmoil of the nineteenth century. Reconstruction merged with the problems of industrialization; as America rose to the status of a world power, the American peace movement joined European activists in the call for an international system of peace-keeping based not on an inner light of peace made manifest in social reform but on the authority of law, on international arbitration and international agreements.

Immanuel Kant and "Perpetual Peace": Peace from the Top Down

The notion of peace realized through international agreements and based on the authority of law represented an old dream. And while the Quakers were spreading their inner light through parts of the Old and New Worlds, Immanuel Kant was writing his essay "Perpetual Peace." Kant, like many philosophers before him, was aware of the problems of international relations and the state of war which existed between nations. They were interested in establishing a federation of states that would, by means of international treaties, halt the scourge of war. As F. H. Hinsley points out,

> Every scheme for the elimination of war that men have advocated since 1917 has been nothing but a copy or an elaboration of some seventeenth century programme--as the seventeenth century programmes were elaborations of still earlier schemes.[16]

How can this be? The world of the twentieth century is far removed from that of the seventeenth. Is twentieth-century thought regarding the prevention of war similar to seventeenth century and earlier peace proposals? An analysis of Kant's proposal for perpetual peace and its relation to the structure of institutions such as the League of Nations or the United Nations may shed some light on this question. The analysis, for the purpose of this thesis, will focus on Kant's top down proposals while bearing in mind that he also promoted the public use of one's reason as a necessary influence on public policy.

In the Europe of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the foundations of our modern era were being laid. The sixteenth century invention of the printing press made possible the large-scale dissemination of new ideas and attitudes. Vernacular literature was made available to the masses and this in turn strengthened the forces of nationalism and the nation-state. The seeds of a mass society were fertilized by the abundance of new information and the number of new concepts that became available to the reader. This period also encouraged the spread of education and saw the growth of the individual within civil society.

The Kantian conception of civil society was somewhat like this: men are motivated by self-interest and they are forced into civil society out of necessity. However, they soon realize that unrestrained self-interest leads to suffering; in order to survive, laws become necessary and must be followed. These laws must become the foundation of the state. The state then becomes the mediator between the antagonisms of human beings. The state with its coercive power is created to ensure that the actions of others do not violate our freedom. Thus, Kant claims, man is an animal who needs a master. This Kantian state, seen as man's master, ensures peace and human progress by suppressing but not destroying man's competitive drives.

This Kantian view of civil society had its international counterpart. According to Kant, a state cannot develop in isolation from the rest of the world. The actions of one state, like the actions of individuals in civil society, affect the practices of other states. Thus, international states have the same relationship to one another as do individuals in civil society. Within the state, neither freedom nor the enjoyment of rights are possible without law and the government. The obligation to obey the government is a product of man's reason and is necessary to secure human rights. The obligation to treat others as ends and never merely as means requires us to treat other humans as persons who have rights that ought to be protected. This obligation, which men realize in civil society, also functions in the relationship between states.

In the Eighth Thesis of Kant's Idea for a Universal History, he points out the relation between civil society and independent states. Kant put it this way:

> The history of mankind can be seen, in the large, as the realization of nature's secret plan to bring forth a perfectly constituted state as the only condition in which the capacities of mankind can be fully developed, and also bring forth that external relations between states is perfectly adequate to this end.[17]

The end which Kant speaks of--the full development of the human species--can only take place in a condition of peace. Kantian peace requires enlightenment: enlightened public debate and enlightened moral leaders who are realized through the gradual education of human beings. But, Kant points out:

> Our world rulers at present have no money left over for public education and for anything that concerns what is best in the world, since all they have is already committed to future wars, they will find it in their own interests not to hinder the weak and slow, independent efforts of their people in this work.[18]

Kant's thoughts on public education, like his essay "Perpetual Peace," have a contemporary ring to them.

In "Perpetual Peace," Kant set out a strategy for the realization of a state of international peace. The essay takes the form of a peace treaty. Part One sets out the six preliminary articles which are, for Kant, the necessary steps for the realization of perpetual peace among states. The authority of international law, Kant maintains, would result in the establishment of an international league of free states, small and large, subject to the restrictions of international law.

In the Kantian world, international law creates the coercion that is necessary to counterbalance the natural antagonism that exists between states. Wars--and the continual preparation for them--will accomplish, for the individual states, what reason could have accomplished without the infliction of suffering. For Kant--with the eventual triumph of reason, enlightened public debate, and enlightened moral leaders--the education of women and men will place them under the principles of a lawful order within their own nations. Then the lawful order within nations will result in a lawful international order.

This Kantian position is clearly articulated in the essay "Perpetual Peace" (1795). There are parts of the treaty that are as relevant today as they were in 1795. The first part of the essay outlines the six preliminary articles which contain the necessary steps for the realization of perpetual peace among states. The second part outlines the three definitive articles which, for Kant, represent the conditions necessary for the establishment of a lasting peace. The final sections consist of two supplements and two appendices which reinforce the claims made in the previous section of the work.

Kant's six preliminary articles follow:

> The Preliminary Articles For Perpetual Peace Among States.
> 1. No Treaty of Peace Shall Be Held Valid in Which There Is Tacitly Reserved Matter for a Future War.
> 2. No Independent States, Large or Small, Shall Come Under the Dominion of Another State by Inheritance, Exchange, Purchase, or Donation.
> 3. Standing Armies . . . Shall In Time Be Totally Abolished.
> 4. National Debts Shall Not Be Contracted with a View to the External Friction of States.
> 5. No State Shall by Force Interfere with the Constitution or Government of Another State.
> 6. No State Shall, during War, Permit Such Acts of Hostility Which Would Make Mutual Confidence in the Subsequent Peace Impossible: Such Are The Employment of Assassins . . . Poisoners . . . Breach of Capitulation and Incitement to Treason . . . in the Opposing State.[19]

In Article 6, Kant gives us a formula for the honorable conduct of war. Kant seems to think that while war is necessary for the development of human beings, it can be conducted in the most civilized way possible. This article illustrates Kant's view that the establishment of perpetual peace is realized over time. Many contemporary peace-makers maintain that peace must come now. These same peace-makers would consider Article 6 dated and remind us of the potential of nuclear war. To use Kantian terms, they would point out that the existence of nuclear weapons will permit peace only in the "vast burial ground of the human race."

Article 5 is an important article for comparison with the contemporary international situation. One might consider the Soviet Union's position in Afghanistan or the actions of the United States in Central America. But it is difficult sometimes to distinguish between a state lawfully protecting its own interests and one committing a definite act of aggression. Perhaps Kant's two hundred-year-old principle of non-intervention bears reconsidering.

Kant recognizes that Articles 2, 3, and 4 will not be realized for some time; however, these articles also have a familiar ring and indeed are a part of our present international situation. Article 2 calls for the freedom and autonomy of states. That call would be welcomed in many states today. Article 3 is as relevant and important today as it was two hundred years ago. Standing armies, through their very existence, are a cause of war, Kant says. He goes on to point out that when we pay people to kill or be killed, we are using them as mere machines, as means to an end; as a result, they become tools in the hand of another and this is not compatible with treating others as ends in themselves. The present international situation will bear witness to Kant's foresight when he wrote Article 3.

Article 4 need only be examined in light of present-day America:

> Consider but one aspect of the matter: the consequences of the Carter-Reagan military budget, $2,089 billion from 1981 to 1988. If implemented, this appropriation will sharply raise the ratio of military to civilian use of the country's production resources to $87 (military): $100 (civilian) by 1988.[20]

Clearly, Kant was on the right track when he claimed that war expenses would be harmful to the development of states and their people. When a state directs its resources toward war and armaments, the people suffer through decreased social benefits such as education and health care. However, with conflicting claims regarding the necessity and character of military budgets and given the unclear distinction between peaceful and military spending, Article 4 is not as clear-cut as it first appears.

The establishment of civil society marks a major step on the road to peace. In "The First Definitive Article for Perpetual Peace," Kant claims that the constitution of every state shall be republican. The republican constitution, Kant thinks, is truly representative of the people: "Republicanism is the political principle of the separation of the executive power . . . from the legislative."[21] The constitution, Kant tells us, is the act of the general will through which many persons become one nation.[22] Under a republican constitution, the citizen can consider all laws as being an extension of his will. In this way, Kant says, before war is declared the people must give their consent. But once the people must fight in a war, pay the costs, and repair the damage, their consent will not come easily.

The next step on the road to perpetual peace is a law of nations (International Law) founded on a federation of free nations. Kant proposes the federation of free states as an attainable goal, a league of peace that would, through the process of evolution, end all wars forever. The third definitive article takes the evolutionary process one step further to include "The Law of World Citizenship." This law acknowledges the principle of global unity. Kant explains global unity in this way:

> A violation of rights in one place is felt throughout the world, the idea of a law of world citizenship is no high-flown or exaggerated notion. It is a supplement to the unwritten code of the civil and international law indispensable for the maintenance of the public human rights and hence also of perpetual peace.[23]

The goal of perpetual peace demands an acknowledgement of a universal human right to the face of the earth. It demands an end to the oppression that many minorities suffer as the march of progress and trade oppress people and destroy their cultures. This goal would appear to conflict with Kant's earlier claim that commercial trade will unite the peoples of the world. Imperial expansion and trade did bring Europeans into contact with many peoples of the world; however, the non-Europeans (the contacted) were often treated as means rather than ends. One need only reflect on the process of colonization and the economic doctrine of mercantilism which was responsible for the exploitation of colonies by their colonizers or on the horrors of the slave trade as men pursued commercial interests and international trade. Kant would have been familiar with these problems. One wonders why he did not see the apparent contradiction between the notion of world citizenship and his claim that the spirit of commerce unites the peoples of the world.[24] However, the Law of World Citizenship was a clear call for equality, an early recognition of global interdependence, and an evolutionary step on the road to perpetual peace. Kant's call for a world federation of free states was answered in part by the League of Nations and is, in many ways, similar to the goals of the United Nations. Kant's peace plan highlights specific steps necessary to improve relations between states and other measures such as the abolition of standing armies that would remove some of the causes of war. The spirit of these articles (1-6) is as important today as it was two hundred years ago.

The Kantian vision of perpetual peace is, from the perspective of attainable goals, inconceivable one might say. The world is far from perfect: religious and national prejudices drive a wedge between societies, some states violate human rights daily, while others support aggressive military attacks and occupy one another's territory seemingly without provocation. How is Kant's vision of perpetual peace to be taken seriously in such a world? The American and French Revolutions held a promise of a Kantian evolution of civil society. Both revolutions inaugurated republican states. Under a republican constitution, Kant said, before a war is declared the people must give their consent. And that consent will not come easily. However, the two revolutions also introduced the concept of "nation in arms" or "total war." The human suffering that has been caused by "total war" does not need to be elaborated on at this point. Less than one hundred years after Kant's essay "Perpetual Peace" was published, Marx claimed that institutional structures such as the state, the law, and the relations of production will not, as Kant claimed, lead to peace. The very structures of capitalist society, Marx maintained, perpetuate class warfare--not perpetual peace.

Other Approaches to Peace and Peace Education

Peace Through Social Revolution: Karl Marx

Karl Marx, like Immanuel Kant before him, held firmly to the belief that an eventual state of peace would be realized by mankind. Peace, Marx predicted, would be realized through the revolutionary nature of the class struggle and through the abolishment of the state, its institutions, and its coercive power.

Law, he claimed, is a tool of the capitalist class and used to manipulate workers. Internal peace, for Marx, would come about only through the revolutionary transformation of society. Between capitalist and communist society, Marx said, lies the period of revolutionary transformation. Through this transformation, the classless state of communism and an eventual state of international peace would follow the victory of the proletariat in all countries. In this way, the exploitation of one individual by another, the antagonism between classes, and the hostility of one nation to another will come to an end.

The problem of class struggle, for Marx, is a problem of alienation. According to this view, when human societies develop beyond the primitive stage, the process of specialization and the division of labor begin. Once specialization develops, individuals are no longer producing everything they need to support their lives. Where they were previously self-sufficient, they now depend on others for some of their needs. With the institution of private property, specialization, and the division of labor, society becomes fragmented into groups and in this way, Marx tells us, workers become instruments of production in a capitalist society. Marx explains the characteristics of capitalism in this way:

> We presupposed private property; the separation of labor, capital and land and therefore of wages, profit of capital and rent of land; the division of labor; competition, the concept of exchange value, etc . . . . [Thus] the worker sinks to the level of a commodity . . . [until finally] the whole of society must fall apart into two classes--those of property owners and of property-less workers.[25]

These two classes--the bourgeoisie and the proletariat--are, according to Marx, "the product of a long course of development, or a series of revolutions in the modes of production and of exchange."[26]

Class division at the political and economic level results in a further ideological division. The social structure and the state, Marx says, are continually evolving out of the life processes of individuals. In the social production of their lives, people enter into relations of production that correspond to a particular stage in the development of the forces of production. He writes,

> The sum total of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society--the real foundation on which rises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production of material life determines the social, political and intellectual life process in general. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but, on the contrary, their social being that determines their consciousness.[27]

In this way people, in developing their material production, modify their ways of thinking. Because of this, Marx maintains, the mode of production determines the general character of social relations. At a certain stage of this Marxist society, the material productive forces come in conflict with the relations of production and the era of social revolution begins.

Social revolution for Marx manifests itself in the class struggle. The ensuing conflict between the mode of production and the social relations of production amounts to a conflict between the owners of the means of production (the bourgeoisie) and the workers (the proletariat). The proletariat become aware of their alienation and exploitation. They also become aware of the clash between the forces of production (technology) and the relations of production (people and institutions). It is this imbalance between the method of production and the social structure of society that creates class conflict. As Marx points out, "The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles."[28]

Class struggles, in the Marxist view, are caused by conflicting economic interests. The Marxist state in the class struggle supports the ruling class through state institutions such as education, law, and political authority. The resulting coercion provides the means for the exploitation of the proletariat by the bourgeoisie. Marx put it this way: "Political power, properly so called, is merely the organized power of one class for oppressing another."[29]

This duality within the structure of society illustrates the conflict between the relations of production and the mode of production. In the resulting class conflict, one class--the bourgeoisie--is able to exploit the proletariat through the manipulation of state institutions. The bourgeoisie's interests lie in preserving its own privileged position. The other class, the proletariat, becomes dissatisfied and intent on changing the exploitative nature of the social structure. The self-interested perception of the bourgeoisie (exploiter) develops into a class ideology and conflicts with needs of the proletariat (exploited). The result is an imbalance between the mode of production and the social relations of the society. This imbalance effects a revolutionary transformation of society. Through this process, the war between the classes will culminate in a victory for the proletariat; workers will regain control over their lives and the alienation of labor will be overcome.

The establishment of a communist society within nations, according to Marx, will end alienation and class struggle. This internal state of peace will be reflected in international affairs and usher in a state of world peace. Marx describes the situation in this way: "In proportion as the exploitation of one individual by another is put an end to, the exploitation of one nation by another will also come to an end."[30] The end of capitalism, Marx argues, will be brought about by the contradiction within the system itself. Capitalism, he says, creates a society in which the mode of production profits the bourgeoisie and exploits the worker. The more capitalism succeeds, the more it is organized on a large scale. Large scale organization and increasing mechanization result in increasing alienation of the workers. With the introduction of machinery, the capitalist is able to produce more goods at a lower cost. However, this same increase in production is experienced by other capitalists, his competitors. As a result, his individual interests conflict with his class interests. The increasing outlay for machinery and the resulting surplus goods create a condition of declining profit; workers become unemployed and a series of crises such as hunger, depression, and war shake society. These unstable conditions also create conflict between nations.

International capitalism, according to Marx, will suffer the same fate as national capitalism. The competition for international markets will bring capitalist nations into conflict. International trade, controlled by the bourgeoisie and fueled by the rapid development of the means of production, Marx points out, has drawn the most barbarous nations into commercial relations. The increasing mechanization of the means of production and a declining profit margin send the capitalist on a search for new markets. The unavoidable result of the ensuing competition is conflict and struggle: conflict between the particular interests of individual capitalists and the common interests of the capitalist's class. The expansion of the capitalist system creates further class divisions that polarize into an international bourgeoisie and an international proletariat. Thus the economic crisis of over-production rears its head, causing depression and war. These crises, for Marx, precipitate the revolution of the proletariat in all countries.

The perpetual peace of Immanuel Kant was also realized through war. War, Kant maintained, will compel people to submit to public laws.[31] Marx maintained that peace would come with the disappearance of the state and its coercive power. Kant considered the existence of the state as a necessary condition of world peace. The Kantian state of perpetual peace was built on the respect for law both within states and between states. International peace, for Kant, was maintained by international law. Law, for Marx, is a tool of the capitalist class and used to legitimize the exploitation of one person by another. Kant considered it man's duty to contribute to the progress of the human race and the realization of a state of perpetual peace. This realization, Kant maintained, might not come about in one lifetime, but it is the eventual goal of the human race.

Marx considered the problem more urgent than Kant. He maintained that social revolution was the only way to peace. In the Kantian state there could be no revolution. To revolt was to disobey the law and law, for Kant, provided the foundation for a state of peace. The government of a Kantian state could be changed gradually through reform. But this reform must take place under the authority of law and be built on public enlightenment, freedom of expression, and an enlightened moral leader. The result, for a Kantian state, would be the eventual realization of a republican constitution. Reform in a Marxist state is the result of a social revolution. Kant's public enlightenment becomes, for Marx, the education of the proletariat. In this way, the Communists would educate the proletariat and aid in establishing a new social order.

Peace for Marx would come through a new social order. This order, Marx wrote, would appear with the disappearance of capitalism and the state institutions which supported it. He predicted the rise and demise of world capitalism through the united action of the workers from all countries. Before the first World War, the International Workingmen's Association and groups such as the International Workers of the World were pointing in the direction indicated by Marx. However, with the coming of the capitalist war, their solidarity was tested and it failed. Workers from all countries deserted the working men's movements to answer their nations' call. It would appear that Marx underestimated the deep-seated power of nationalism and patriotism when he called for the workers of the world to unite. He also underestimated the power of capitalism to overcome such crises as hunger, depression, and war. He did predict its growth, the rise of capitalist power, and its concentration into larger and larger units that would adopt monopolistic practices. For Marx, it was this rise and the growth of imperialism that contained the seeds of revolution. With the worldwide growth of capitalism, Marx said, the international class is created. Through imperialism, the capitalist mode of production comes into conflict with the social relations of international populations. The result of this class conflict leads to a polarization of classes on an international level. This growth of capitalism and its inherent crises sow the seeds of a peaceful world which for Marx is a communist world composed of communist societies.

The Marxian critique of capitalist society is summarized by Marvin Harris in the following way. He writes, "The guiding thread in Marx's periodization is the progressive and gradual emergence of alienated men conditioned to sell their only possession—their labour, which they cease to regard as part of themselves."[32] Thus with the dawning of the Industrial Revolution and the deepening influence of the mechanistic approach, human workers became factory "hands" and the best worker became the "lead hand." The new factory towns were regulated by the town clock. The economy, like the clock, was seen as a mechanism that should not be tampered with. In the poem "Day and Night," Dorothy Livesay is able to communicate a sense of the exploitation and dehumanization of industrial workers in a way that only poets can. She writes,

> Dawn, red and angry, whistles loud and sends
> A geysered shaft of steam searching the air,
> Scream after scream announces that the churn
> Of life must move, the giant arm command.
> Men in a stream, a moving human belt
> Move into sockets, everyone a bolt.
> The fun begins, a humming whirring drum—
> Men do a dance in time to the machines.
> One Step Forward
> Two Steps Back
> Shove the lever,
> Push it back.[33]

It was the alienation of which Livesay speaks that aroused the social criticism of Marx. Marxists advocated the counter-ideology of socialism; they demanded basic changes in the existing economic system and wanted to substitute the values and behavior of individualism with those of collectivism. In the Eleventh Thesis on Feuerbach, Marx writes that up to now, "Philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways; the point is to change it."[34] For Marx the change would come through class warfare and social revolution.

Peace Movements and Peace Education in America

However, despite the Marxist prediction of class warfare and of peace through social revolution, the values of the market place reigned supreme. The mechanization of society meant the mechanization of warfare. The newly industrialized countries were locked in a deadly arms race. And as a result, "In the mystique of racially inspired patriotism, nations made war with increasing efficiency while blunting the divisive effects of class antagonism at home."[35] Racism and the growth of capitalism spread. As Harris claims:

> It helped to maintain slavery and serfdom; it smoothed the way for the rape of Africa and the slaughter of the American Indian; it steeled the nerves of the Manchester captains of industry as they lowered wages, lengthened the working day and hired more women and children.[36]

Yet at the same time Liberalism, which was the prevailing ideology of the ruling middle classes, was also logically committed to advance the status and security of the individual in society.

> Consequently, the latter part of the nineteenth century and the decade preceding the First World War saw improvement in three basic areas: the granting of such fundamental political rights as universal male suffrage (women had to bide their time until after the war), civil liberties and the free expression of opinion, an increase in the distribution of wealth and the commencement of social welfare; and the spread of free and compulsory elementary education, which by 1900, had become almost universal in the west.[37]

These liberal advances, however, took place within a mechanical world view that dominated most thought processes. From within this mechanical perspective, humans looked upon nature as something to control and exploit. This dualism set the individual apart from the rest of humanity. Humans now could be referred to as "hands"--part of the machine, "everyone a bolt." While this dehumanizing process was taking place, American peace groups shattered in the wake of the civil war. The concern with an inner light of peace made manifest in social reform had dimmed with the nineteenth century's romantic view of human perfection. In its place arose a peace movement of a more practical nature and a top down approach. The peace movement in progressive America was guided by business leaders such as Andrew Carnegie, by high-profile lawyers, and by leading political figures. Between 1906 and 1911, they formed the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and the World Peace Foundation. Their intention was to foster international cooperation through the legal settlement of disputes and to create agencies that would transfer the experts' knowledge of peace to the masses. Church groups such as the Federal Council of Churches in America joined the prestigious group.[38] This peace activity was not restricted to America, and international peace organizations were created at a phenomenal rate.

In the United States, between 1901 and 1914, forty-five new peace organizations were created. Estimates place the number of peace groups active in 1900 at 425. These peace groups were promoting peace in Britain, Germany, France, the United States, Russia, and Scandinavia. Universal Peace Congresses were held annually and it seemed as though humanity was on the verge of abolishing war.[39] Peace would be negotiated through international agreements and, as a result of these agreements, handed to the masses from the top down and not, as in the Quaker tradition, from the inside out. The movement kept growing and, in 1902, textbook publisher Edward Ginn of Boston established and personally endowed an international School of Peace which later became the World Peace Foundation. The task of the International School of Peace was to support and organize efforts for peace education in schools and colleges. Eight years before that, in Boston, Ginn had established a library of textbooks which did not promote nationalism or glorify war. The call for peace and international goodwill was shouted in the highest circles.

In the latter part of the nineteenth century and up until the outbreak of the First World War, the American Peace Society (peace from the top down) worked for the elimination of war. Its efforts focused on campaigning for universal compulsory arbitration between nations, establishing an international court of justice, and lobbying Congress and government officials. "The Society's supporters were predominantly middle-class: well-to-do businessmen figured prominently among its membership during this period."[40] The Society worked to further their goals through international peace congresses, but they failed to address the roots of war or its economic and social causes.

The Universal Peace Union, on the other hand, working during the same period, sought to:

> remold society in a spirit of Christian love and human brotherhood. War was the supreme negation of this ideal; hence, the preservation of peace between the nations, along with the achievement of social justice within the nation, was the practical goal for which . . . the union must work.[41]

The Union's policies also included many of the goals of the American Peace Society. Their publications pointed out the economic wastes of war, its inefficiency as a method of solving disputes, and its basic immorality. The Society urged the United States to lead the world in adopting a policy of unilateral disarmament. They also:

> campaigned against capital punishment as a violation of the sacredness of all human life. The Union also worked to reform education: they worked to eliminate the war spirit from school textbooks, to end military drill in school or college and to allow no war-like playthings for children. Membership was drawn from a variety of religious sects. Women made up one-third of the members and their vital role in bringing about a peaceful world was recognized.[42]

But that world would have to wait. Peace groups were unable to halt the arms race that raged among the industrialized countries; finally, in 1914, Europe exploded into war. The explosion destroyed much of the international peace movement. Marx's claim that workers have no country was proven wrong in 1914 when they rushed to the front and died for their country. For most Americans, the war remained the old world's problem.

The core of the American peace movement during this period was composed of a coalition that included social gospel clergymen, social reformers, labor organizations, and feminists. The movement split into two groups--Liberal Pacifists and Liberal Nationalists, as latent differences were brought to the surface by the crisis brought on by American participation in the First World War. This peace coalition had contained peace-makers functioning from within two of the previously identified paradigms of peace. The first paradigm, a sense of personal peace made manifest through social action, was prominent in the philosophy of the social gospel movement. Liberal Nationalists, on the other hand, were for the most part operating from within the top down paradigm.

The social gospel movement was born in post-Civil War America and reached maturity in the era of progressivism. The light of the social gospel was dimmed by the harsh glare of materialism in the 1920's. The light, however, did not go out. The spirit of the social gospel was alive in the Quaker tradition and has appeared in movements for social reform throughout history. Emerging most recently in the social justice movement, the concern with inner peace has deep historical roots. This point has been made clearly by R. C. White and C. H. Hopkins in their study of the social gospel. They write:

> Toward the end of the progressive era, the social gospel was defined by one of its adherents as "the application of the teaching of Jesus and the total message of Christian salvation to society, the economic life, and social institutions . . . as well as to individuals.[43]

Members of the social gospel movement played a prominent part in the work of the Liberal Pacifists.

Liberal Nationalists, on the other hand, hoped to further the cause of peace by attacking war at its source, in Europe, and subjecting it to the power of the American reform tradition. This tradition, they maintained, had already rid the world of slavery, closed the saloons, and freed women from their legal bondage.[44] For the Liberal Pacifists, however, peace came through the non-violent resolution of conflicts.

The Liberal Pacifists, a group which included feminists, labor groups, and social gospel clergymen, claimed that war was a "symptom of systematic injustice." Peace, they said, stemmed from the non-violent resolution of human conflict and social injustice. They held that,

> Peace subsisted in the amelioration of collective suffering. Gathering in groups like the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, the Fellowship of Reconciliation, and the War Resisters' League, liberal pacifists worked to develop non-violent techniques toward fundamental social change that operated in a transnational manner leaping across the constraints of the existing state system. Attacked for their wartime skepticism, they felt little of the progressive faith in America's exceptionalism. Liberal pacifists desired instead to cultivate a global mind. They wanted to develop a consciousness of human community that transcended state boundaries and that joined men in an awareness of their common humanity. "I start from the world view of humanity," John Haynes Holmes avowed, "from the idea that our problems today are all one. That our battle is a single battle the world round."[45]

In America, ideological divisions destroyed organized labor's power as a force for social change. The movement was crippled by a series of failed strikes, economic dislocation, and government-business attacks. American Federation of Labour (AFL) president Samuel Gompers answered the call of the war effort. He worked to promote organized labor's interests through direct cooperation with government and business. The labor movement had historically been divided over another question: the AFL's plans to organize along trade unionist lines and socialist plans to organize workers on a mass basis. The division deepened as the AFL backed the war effort and antiwar socialists were attacked and jailed.[46] Consider, for example, the stance of the Industrial Workers of the World, a United States-based anti-war socialist union.

During its 1916 convention, the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW), a labor union based in the United States, passed the following resolution: "We condemn all wars and, for the preservation of such we proclaim the anti-military propaganda of peace . . . and in time of war, the general strike in all industries."[47] This resolution was a major factor in prompting what have become known as the Palmer Red Raids: "federal courts and local police raided homes and halls in more than fifty cities across the country." The IWW was a major target, and "[e]veryone inside the halls—including the clerical staff--was arrested."[48] Altogether, more than 5 000 suspected communists were arrested and the IWW was virtually wiped out. In the words of Zechariah Chafee, Jr., a Harvard Law School professor, it was "the greatest executive restriction of personal liberty in the history of this country."[49]

Peace Making and International Education

Somehow the spark of peace survived the horror of World War I. In the 1920's, the League of Nations sponsored initiatives in international education. They called for schools to "promote the spirit of international cooperation."[50] Peace educators were active in both France and Britain. Educators found serious problems with school history programs and school textbooks. They claimed that the programs and books, in many cases, were nothing more than national propaganda. To resolve this problem, educators stated that textbooks should be pacifist, opposed to the inculcation of hatred, and promote a fraternal spirit. French educators called for the League of Nations to "judge textbooks; to prepare school programs and to organize international efforts to improve the teaching of peace."[51]

United States educators shared the European concern with curriculum and textbooks. John Dewey, reflecting on the state of post-war America, wrote:

> We need a curriculum in history, literature and geography which will make the different racial elements in this country aware of what each has contributed and will create a mental attitude which will make it more difficult for the flames of hatred and suspicion to sweep over this country in the future.

And in the schools, he added, children will develop:

> . . . feelings of respect and friendliness for other nations and peoples of the world.[52]

This issue seemed quite clear: industrialization had given birth to mass destruction and total war; the world must have peace. American peace workers worked through the League of Nations. With the Kellogg-Briand Pact (1928), they hoped to abolish war.[53] But the world economy bottomed out and the world drifted into another war. In 1939, the Canadian pacifist and social gospel advocate J. S. Woodsworth cast the only vote against Canada's entry into World War II.[54]

Again the peace movement, peace education, and the attempt at social reform were brought to a halt by the guns of war. Educators had hoped to help create a better world through international understanding and education. Many peace activists considered the war necessary to rid the world of the Fascist menace. But the unspeakable horror of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the destruction of fifty-five million lives, and the Russian threat saw peace in the Western nations become identified with the containment of communism. The policy of containment produced a Cold War internationally and resulted in the Korean conflict. Communist hysteria raged in the United States, Senator Joseph McCarthy conducted his communist witch hunts, and a Canadian Royal Commission uncovered several spy rings in the Canadian bureaucracy. The Cold War hysteria touched the general population, and the construction of fallout shelters became a profitable business. The effect on education, however, was more profound.

Critics of progressive education, active in the United States after the late 1930's, focused on Alberta. Alberta, under Education Minister William Aberhart and Supervisor of Schools H. C. Newland, introduced the Alberta version of progressive education to the province in 1936. The program was based on the philosophy and methods of progressive education and was a by-product of the American movement. This attempt at educational reform was part of a "nation-wide curriculum reform based upon the 'progressive element in American Education,'" an element which saw education as the key to social reconstruction.[55] The direction of social reconstruction in the era of progressive education (1920-1950) was most succinctly stated by Canadian educator Mary Crawford. In the mid-1930's she wrote:

> A new social order is emerging and there is a widespread belief that the school should do something about it . . . . Consider these principles: Poverty in the midst of potential abundance is both intolerable and ridiculous. Democracy is the best form of government . . . . War must give way to international cooperation among nations.[56]

The essence of these principles will appear again in the mid-1980's as part of the dimensions of peace education. And they will, as did the principles articulated by Mary Crawford, draw much criticism. Progressive education programs were child-centered and "activity based." Through pedagogical methods that promoted self-development and harmonious group relations, progressive educators saw education as an instrument for changing society. The "modern" programs of the progressive educators, critics argued, focused on contemporary issues and "undermined traditional education."[57] Critics will shout similar warnings about peace education. In 1953, however, after a decade of criticism, educationalists such as Hilda Neatby pressed for a return to more traditional methods in education. Yet despite the return to traditional methods of education, important developments took place in the international arena.

The United Nations (UN), established in 1945, represented the next evolutionary step to establish an international league to prevent war. The UN Charter was signed by representatives of fifty nations. In 1948, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations. The next step was taken on December 16, 1966, when the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights were adopted by the United Nations' General Assembly. The two Covenants and the Universal Declaration make up the International Bill of Rights. The UN developed in the Kantian tradition of an international organization to keep the peace. However, the base of the UN and its perspective on peace is much broader than that envisioned by Kant. Despite this evolutionary development, post-war America was trapped in a Cold War. The hysteria of this period touched the general population and left a lasting mark on education.

Education critics were active in America, and in September of 1958 the American Congress "enacted the National Defense Education Act, which authorized federal grants especially for training in mathematics, science, and modern languages, as well as for student loans and fellowships."[58] The injection of millions of dollars into the education system was prompted by the fear of Russian superiority in science and technology. This fear reached crisis proportions with the Soviet launching of the first man-made satellite, Sputnik. During this period of bomb shelters, the Cold War, and the National Defense Education Act, school curricula focused on traditional subjects and methods of instruction. Social reform, peace movements, and peace education were simmering under layers of fear and communist hysteria. But change was brewing.

In Norway, in 1959, the International Peace Research Institute (PRIO) was established under the leadership of Johann Galtung to study problems related to structural violence and international conflict. The institute publishes two leading journals of peace research: the Journal of Peace Research and the Bulletin of Peace Proposals. Structural violence, Galtung and others argued, exists both within and between states. The term "structural violence" describes the "violence that is built into social, political and economic structures such as discrimination based on gender, ethnic group or social class, and the gap between rich and poor countries."[59] Researchers asked, When social structures are responsible for suffering, hunger, and even death, how can we be at peace? The work of Galtung and other peace researchers was responsible for broadening the definition of peace to include structural violence and social change.

In America, the Journal of Conflict Resolution was first published in 1960, and the Center for Conflict Resolution was opened soon after. Other institutes were formed in Sweden, such as The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute. Peace studies became part of the course work in many German universities, and in 1963 the International Peace Research Association (IPRA) was established. The IPRA began a network of several hundred scholars worldwide and a newsletter supported by UNESCO.[60] The character of this new movement was shaped by the Cold War, the resulting East-West tension, and the new danger of nuclear war. It was concerned with policy, with inter-state relations, with preventing World War III, and with trying to influence government through its research.[61] As Nigel Young has pointed out, "the initial focus remained on the 'disease' rather than the 'cure.'"[62] The focus was about to change, however, as the character of peace activities was again influenced by the changing social reality of the late 1960's. This change prompted the emergence of the third paradigm of peace-making.

Paradigm Three: Peace from the Bottom Up

American universities and schools became a hotbed of protest in the late 1960's. The peace movement entered the 1960's with as broad a following as at any other time in history.[63] Powered by students, intellectuals, and women's groups, the peace movement gained new momentum. The Student Peace Union was formed and directed its energies toward ending the nuclear arms race and international militarism. Intellectuals such as David Riesman, Eric Fromm, and Lewis Mumford established The Committee of Correspondence and searched for alternatives to the arms race. Veteran federalists established the World Law Fund as an educational branch to the thirteen-year-old Institute for International Order. The goal of the organization was to provide a catalyst for "new thinking commensurate with the realities of our age."[64]

This new thinking had civil rights to deal with, and the grass roots movement that began in the South when Rosa Parks refused to move to the back of the bus in 1955 brought Martin Luther King's philosophy of non-violent protest to the attention of the world. Law suits desegregated schools and a massive protest movement ignited when four black students demanded service at an all-white lunch counter in North Carolina. "Within a week the 'sit-in' movement had spread to six more towns in the state, and within a month to towns in six more states." The student participants, black and white, formed the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) which worked with King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference.[65] The drive for civil rights and racial equality tore at the fabric of the nation as more protest groups formed and students, black and white, challenged institutionalized racism and official discrimination. In 1964, the Civil Rights Act was signed by President Lyndon Johnson and civil rights in the United States took a step forward. The step, however, was a faltering one for America. In 1966 Chicago, Cleveland, and forty other American cities had race riots. One year later, Newark and Detroit were in flames. The flames were matched, though, by the explosions destroying Vietnam.

The pacifists and social reformers who took part in the civil rights movement had a war on their hands. The Vietnamese War reached the television screens of an outraged America. Again schools and university campuses exploded in protest. Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) and other groups such as the Student Peace Union (SPU) added to the mounting anti-war protests. Campus teach-ins on Vietnam swept the country, and an SDS-sponsored demonstration drew 25 000 demonstrators to Washington to call for an end to the war. Activism grew and demonstrations drew hundreds of thousands. In April of 1971, 300 000 anti-war protestors demonstrated in Washington and 150 000 in San Francisco. One month later, 12 000 anti-war demonstrators were arrested in Washington.[66] Clearly, the peace movement had changed character. It was a "grass roots" movement and unlike earlier peace movements did not depend on directions from the experts or elite. The movement was instrumental in bringing an end to the war in Vietnam, but it did not stop there. Many pacifists and educators were concerned with the problem of war. They were also concerned with the mounting global problems of the arms race, nuclear proliferation, resource depletion, and the widening gap between the rich and the pocr.[67] Consequently, the peace research and education movement, fueled by the insights of Johann Galtung, one of its leading theorists, began to define peace in much broader terms.

On April 20, 1970, "a generation dedicated itself to reclaiming the planet."[68] Earth Day, 1970, symbolized the growing concern over environmental problems. In organizing for Earth Day, the staff of Environmental Action "served as the national coordinating office for local groups on 2 000 campuses, in 2 000 communities and in 10 000 high schools . . ." throughout the United States.[69] Many people in the "new" peace movements (post-Vietnam) began to see human destructiveness as a fundamental problem. And pacifists, including those involved in peace research and education movements, saw their work in a new way:

> Peace became redefined in terms of social change . . . the division between intellectual work and activism grew less. The pacifist element in peace research also grew less significant, as the notion of pursuing social justice by any means took over from the rejection of war and violence. The focus at the same time was switched from the physical violence implied in war, to the so-called "structural" violence seen as latent in capitalism, imperialism, colonialism and racism--and indeed in the state itself.[70]

The definition of peace had broadened considerably, and a new dimension was added at Bradford University's course on peace studies: personal peace and international peace. If one does not have peace within oneself, how can one expect to find it in the world?

The roots of this third paradigm of peace-making, peace from the bottom up, reach back to early Christianity. They were transplanted to the new world by the Quakers and cultivated by advocates of the social gospel. The roots are now being nourished by the social justice impulse of contemporary churches. This paradigm is characterized by the notion of personal peace working from the inside out.

The roots of the third paradigm also reach deep into the second: peace from the top down. This was illustrated most clearly in the writings of Immanuel

Kant and other advocates of peace through the authority of law: international law, international agreements and arbitration, negotiated by experts. International organizations have made important advances in the struggle for world peace. The United Nations, despite its imperfections, is most notable through the promotion of human rights, the resolution of political and military conflicts, the promotion of economic and social development, and the educational efforts of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

Peace from within, the third paradigm of peace making, begins with the action of the people, the grass roots. It is reinforced by a sense of personal peace that is internally related to the social reality and supported through the work of national and international institutions. Consider the words of Phillip Berryman. He writes:

> The shift that is underway may turn out to be as significant as the Protestant Reformation . . . . Liberation Theology is also one manifestation of a worldwide movement for human emancipation . . . . When the history of our age is written—perhaps by a non-white hand—it may also be the story of the emergence onto the stage of history of the poor majority of the human family.[71]

In The Turning Point, Fritzof Capra writes:

> The current crisis, therefore, is not just a crisis of individuals, governments, or social institutions; it is a transition of planetary dimensions. As individuals, as a society, as a civilization, and a planetary ecosystem, we are reaching the turning point.[72]

Reflecting on the changes in contemporary society, Liberation Theologian Blase Bonpane claims that "A new person is being formed. This person, this revolutionary person insists that human values be applied to government."[73] Bonpone and other Liberation Theologians integrate personal peace with social action. This sense of social responsibility is reinforced by values such as justice, equity, and a fundamental respect for human dignity.

Liberation Theology represents a component of the third paradigm of peacemaking. It offers a critique of the way society is organized, it questions the structures that perpetuate oppression, and it represents a more radical manifestation of the social justice impulse of the Roman Catholic Church. When discussing Liberation Theology, Blase Bonpane stresses the importance of peace movements that work from the bottom up. He writes, "Were it not for the great peace movement resisting the Indochina War, there would have been a nuclear holocaust--as Nixon admits in his memoirs." Bonpane adds that groups such as the women of Greenham Common, the Greens of Germany, and the Holy Week Peace Marchers of Europe are guerrillas for peace. "Internationally such guerrillas of peace are identifying new and powerful instruments of change. These new instruments are humane and democratic."[74]

Chapter II Endnotes

[1] P. Brock, Pacifism in the United States (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968), p. 8.

[2] R.T.V., "Friends," Encyclopedia Britannica, 1983, pp. 743-745.

[3] J. Pushon, Portrait in Grey (London: Quaker Home Service Friends House, 1984), p. 99.

[4] Ibid., p. 100.

[5] A. J. Worrall, Quakers in the Colonial North East, (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1980), pp. 9-14.

[6] Ibid., p. 129.

[7] Brock, p. 27.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Ibid., p. 51.

[10] Worrall, p. 165.

[11] Ibid., pp. 163-165.

[12] C. De Benedetti, The Peace Reform in American History (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1980), p. 21.

[13] Brock, p. 258.

[14] De Benedetti, pp. 21-22.

[15] R. W. Winks, "Underground Railroad," The Canadian Encyclopedia (Edmonton: Hurtig, 1985), p. 1864.

[16] F. H. Hinsley, Power and the Pursuit of Peace (Cambridge, MA: University Press, 1963), p. 3.

[17] I. Kant, "Perpetual Peace," in On History, trans. L. W. Beck, R. E. Anchor, and E. L. Fackenheim (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1963), p. 23. (Original work published 1795).

[18] Ibid., p. 23.

[19] Ibid., p. 91.

[20] S. Melman, Profits Without Production (New York: Knopf, 1983), p 263.

[21] Kant, p. 4.

[22] Ibid., pp. 95-96.

[23] Ibid., p. 95.

[24] Ibid., p. 114.

[25] E. Kamenka, *The Portable Karl Marx* (Hammondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1983), p. 131.

[26] Ibid., p. 205.

[27] Ibid., p. 160.

[28] Ibid., p. 203.

[29] Ibid., p. 228.

[30] Ibid., p. 225.

[31] Kant, p. 111.

[32] M. Harris, *The Rise of Anthropological Theory* (New York: Norton, 1968), p. 226.

[33] D. Livesay, "Day and Night," in *An Anthology of Canadian Literature in English*, Vol. 1, R. Brown and D. Bennet, eds. (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1982), p. 1512.

[34] Kamenka, p. 155.

[35] Harris, p. 106.

[36] Ibid.

[37] A. M. Taylor, "Societal Transformation from Paleolithic to Contemporary Times," *Philosophy Forum*, 15, 1977, pp. 323-398.

[38] De Benedetti, p. xiii.

[39] K. Osborne, "Peace Education and the Schools: What Can We Learn From History?" *Peace Education and the Task for Peace Educators*, 1987, p. 11.

[40] Brock, p. 927.

[41] Ibid., p. 928.

[42] Ibid.

[43] R. G. White and C. H. Hopkins, The Social Gospel (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1976), p. xi.

[44] C. De Benedetti, Origins of the Modern American Peace Movement, 1915-1929 (Millwood, NY: KLO, 1978), p. 83.

[45] Ibid., pp. 83-84.

[46] Ibid., pp. 81-82.

[47] P. Carlson, Roughneck (New York: Norton, 1983), p. 241.

[48] Ibid., pp. 305-306.

[49] Ibid., p. 306.

[50] Osborne, p. 16.

[51] Ibid., p. 17.

[52] J. Dewey, "School as a Means of Developing a Social Consciousness and Social Ideas in Children," The Journal of Social Forces, 1, No. 5, 1923, p. 516.

[53] G. B. Tindall, America, Vol. 2 (New York: Norton, 1984), p. 1104.

[54] G. Woodcock, 100 Great Canadians (Edmonton: Hurtig, 1980), p. 106.

[55] R. S. Patterson, "Educational Reform in Western Canada," in Education in Canada: An Interpretation, E. B. Titley and P. Miller, eds. (Calgary: Detselig, 1982), p. 170.

[56] M. Crawford, "The School and the Social Order," in Essays on Canadian Education, eds. N. Kach, K. Mazurek, R. Patterson, and I. De Faveri (Calgary: Detselig Enterprises, 1986), p. 104.

[57] Ibid., p. 127.

[58] Tindall, p. 1251.

[59] R. Lacey, C. Heffernan, and F. Hutchinson, Education for Peace (New South Wales: Canberra Publishing, 1987), p. 136.

[60] N. Young, "The Peace Movement, Peace Research, Peace Education and Peace Building," Bulletin of Peace Proposals, 18, No. 3, 1987, p. 334.

[61] N. Young, "Educating the Peace Educators," Bulletin of Peace Proposals, 12, No. 2, 1981, pp. 124-126.

[62] Ibid.

[63] De Benedetti, The Peace Reform in American History, p. 165.

[64] Ibid., p. 166.

[65] Tindall, p. 1282.

[66] De Benedetti, The Peace Reform in American History, pp. 150-196.

[67] Ibid.

[68] D. Hayes, Earth Day—The Beginning (New York: Arno, 1970), Forward.

[69] Ibid.

[70] Young, "Educating the Peace Educator," p. 125

[71] P. Berryman, Liberation Theology (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1987), pp. 6-7.

[72] F. Capra, The Turning Point (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1983), p. 33.

[73] B. Bonpane, Guerrillas of Peace (Boston: South End Press, 1985), Afterword.

[74] Ibid., p. 19.

CHAPTER III: PEACE: ATTEMPTS AND PROBLEMS WITH DEFINITION

Introduction

This chapter will focus on attempts at defining peace within each of the previously identified paradigms. Whether one views peace from the inside out, the top down, or the bottom up, there is a subtle problem with deciding conclusively on a single definition of peace, however clear and comprehensive in scope. To capture the meaning of peace in this way is to possess a static concept, whereas the crucial meaning of peace, when present, is not a concept from which to draw logical conclusions but a distinctive, fresh, living experience. As Pope Paul was quoted as saying, we achieve peace preparing for peace. While for purposes of enquiry and communication good definitions emphasizing crucial aspects of peace are obviously necessary, it must be kept in mind that peace itself, as quality of experience, is not a conceptual entity nor could it ever be conveyed as such. It must be invited from moment to moment by the very character of our activity: hence the emphasis on peace-making.

Peace and Liberation Theology

So far as aspects of a satisfactory definition of peace are concerned in relation to actual experiences of peace, let us consider liberation theology. Liberation theology, as one manifestation of a paradigm three approach to peace, works from the bottom up. It begins with the social reality of the marginalized and oppressed. Is liberation theology a movement for peace? What does peace mean to liberation theologians? How are we to understand liberation theology? Theo Witvliet defines liberation theology in the following way:

> As theoretical reflection, liberation theology is critical reflection against the background of a praxis nurtured by this experience of faith [an experience which recognizes the living Christ in the lives of the marginalized and oppressed]. This experience--far removed from the individualized and privatized petty-bourgeois experience . . . is the primary element, though there are others.[1]

Critical thinking against the background of praxis as I understand it means that critical reflection and conceptual thought are not the primary focus. These elements are recognized by liberation theologians as being important in themselves, but they are secondary to the evidence of the marginalized and oppressed, secondary to their struggle for basic human rights and for the right to life, food, shelter, health care, and education.

The marginalized and oppressed, in the case of Latin America and other Third World countries are, as Witvliet points out:

> the great majority of people [who] have never had the possibility of sharing in decision making: not in any decisions at all, in politics, in the economy, or even in the church. They have always been forced to listen, to carry out the decisions of others.[2]

Liberation theologians and others understand the situation outlined above to be oppressive. This oppression, they maintain, stems from the nature of society, from its politics, economics, and from the official church. Theology, then, is understood by liberation theologians as the Word of God seen through the eyes of the marginalized and oppressed.

The history of Latin American countries, Witvliet points out, has been marked by a close association between church and state: "The state provides the church with numerous aids and privileges and in exchange for that the church legitimizes existing power relationships."[3] The dominant ideology in many countries in the First and Third Worlds, critics claim, is violent. The violence is not direct but indirect and inflicted structurally through the institutions of society. Structural violence can be external (within the international system) or internal (within national societies). Gustavo Lagos defines structural violence in this way:

> Structural violence, the kind of violence that is not direct, is exerted through innumerable channels not so immediately visible to all observers as for instance war is . . . . At the external level this structural violence comprises the domination-dependence systems in force between the industrialized world and the so-called developing countries. It may take such forms as colonialism or neocolonialism and all the manifestations of imperialism in its various cultural, economic, political, scientific, technological and other aspects. Internal or international structural violence consists of all those systems conducive to the economic exploitation of man by man; all systems that, operating at the social, economic, political and cultural levels in relation to the structure of production, produce alienation (estrangement from society or estrangement from self through society) and, lastly, all those structures of society whereby the individual human being may be prevented from participating in the various processes of social life that are the necessary and inevitable channels for his integral development.[4]

Peace defined in the broad sense, that is including more than the absence of war, must also include the concept of structural violence. To understand and work for the elimination of this form of violence, liberation theologians work from the bottom up—from the concrete experiences of the oppressed. Liberation theology as a liberation process "exhibits varying degrees of radicality. It has different nuances in each Latin American country."[5] But the focus of these popular movements is to call into question "the economic, social and political order that oppress and marginalize them [the popular classes], and of course the ideology that is brought in to justify this domination."[6] From this base, these popular movements seek to understand the roots of the misery and injustice in which millions of people in Latin America and other parts of the world live.

Liberation theologians condemn such oppression and injustice. "Liberation theology stresses liberation from all forms of human oppression: social, economic, physical, racial, environmental, religious . . . . [It insists] that theology must be truly indigenous."[7] A small part of humanity, liberation theologians claim, is progressing and becoming richer every day through the oppression of two-thirds of the world's population. They "appeal to the exploited social classes and the dominated countries to unite for the purpose of defending their rights rather than to beg for help."[8] To accomplish this task, there must be a liberation of the consciousness of the oppressed and a revolutionary transformation of economic and political centers of power. Put more simply, liberationists assert that "the structures of our society must be transformed right down to their roots."[9] Liberation theology speaks out against historical alliances between Christianity and the dominant classes. It is essential "that Christians should place themselves firmly on the side of the exploited thereby breaking this alliance . . . ."[10] In this way, Christianity becomes revolutionary.

Can such a revolutionary movement foster peace? Richard E. Fienberg and Kenneth A. Oye point out, "Revolutionary change within particular Third World nations does not alter the structure of the international economy."[11] The internal violence of a revolution, punctuated by death and injury, is no longer what movements for peace and justice in the world are primarily about.[12] One wonders, though, if the direct experience of oppression and structural violence would lead to a different conclusion. Consider the words of Nicaragúan Minister of Cultural Affairs Ernesto Cardenal's 1981 German Peace Prize acceptance speech. He said:

> Peace is not just the absence of war; peace means basically justice and brotherhood, love. Nicaragua—the people of Nicaragua—fought an armed revolution against injustice and for real peace: war, the violent destruction of an oppressive and inhumane regime, is more than justified if its aim is the creation of a society where men live in peace with each other; this is the real message of Christ.[13]

In 1917, not quite as eloquently, members of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace concluded that "the most effectual means of promoting durable, international peace is to prosecute the war against the Imperial Government of Germany to final victory for democracy."[14] Toward the end of the Second World War, the doctrine of the just war proved flexible enough to justify the "strategic" bombing of German civilians; the atom bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki; and, twenty years later, the death of countless Vietnamese civilians.

However, the televised horror of Vietnam marked a turning point in the just war tradition. What began with early Christian pacifism inside the Roman Empire became, for St. Augustine, a duty to obey the emperor. And if, in following the orders of the emperor, one became involved in an unjust war, "the soldier [according to Aquinas] is innocent because his position makes obedience a duty."[15] In the thirteenth century, St. Thomas Aquinas argued that a war is just if (1) the decision to go to war is made by a legitimate sovereign, (2) there is a just cause, and (3) the war is waged with the right intention.[16]

This tradition has provided the justification for much killing. It supported the killing of both British and American soldiers in the 1776 American War of Independence/Revolution and still echoes in the words of Pope Pius XII. In his 1956 Christmas message, Pope Pius spoke against invoking conscience as the basis for refusing to participate in military service. He said:

> If therefore a body representative of the people and a government—both having been chosen by free elections—in a moment of extreme danger decide, by legitimate instruments of internal and external policy, on defensive precautions, they do not act immorally; so that no catholic citizen can invoke his conscience in order to refuse to serve and fulfill those duties the law imposed. On this matter we feel we are in perfect harmony with our predecessors.[17]

This historic position was challenged in the decades to come.

The spirit of Vatican II was in tune with the third paradigm of peace-making: peace from the bottom up. No longer would the duty to obey take precedence over the dictates of one's conscience. Those who demonstrated for peace and civil rights in the sixties and seventies helped—in their opposition to militarism—to bring an end to the Indo-China War, and in their demands for justice made a significant contribution to the development of civil rights legislation. In 1967, Pope Paul VI commented that a revolutionary uprising runs counter to the common good as it usually produces new injustices to replace the old. He then added,

> save where there is manifest, longstanding tyranny which would do great damage to fundamental personal rights and dangerous harm to the common good of the country. . . . It belongs to laymen, without waiting for orders and directives, to take the initiative freely and infuse a Christian spirit into the mentality, customs, laws and structures of the community in which they live.[18]

This statement represents a historic transition in Catholic social doctrine and a definite break with the 1956 message of Pope Pius XII.[19]

Historically, the just war doctrine, like the messages of the Popes, underwent significant change. This change has paralleled the three paradigms of peacemaking. Peace from the inside out is comparable to early Christian pacifism. In this tradition, all forms of war and violence are rejected unconditionally, as in the Quaker tradition. Paradigm two, peace from the top down, can be compared to the Augustinian notion of obedience that relied on the commands of the emperor. Paradigm three, peace from the bottom up, can be related to the struggles of liberation theologians and other movements for peace around the world.

History, liberation theologians declare, "has been written with a 'white hand,' from the side of the dominators. History's losers have another outlook."[20] The direct historical experience of oppression, torture, rape, and murder year after year living "at the heart of a concrete historical process, and not in the peace and quiet of a library or a dialogue among intellectuals,"' injects a sense of urgency into movements for peace.[21] It is the passive acceptance of structural violence that liberation theologians and other members of popular movements working from the bottom up set out to change.

The need for change is urgent. UNICEF's Director James Grant puts it this way:

> The twelve to thirteen million children who die unnecessarily each year, a majority from malnutrition and hunger related causes, is the equivalent of one hundred and twenty Hiroshimas. If there were a Hiroshima occurring every third day, incinerating 100,000 children, the world would be up in arms. But somehow we accept this—we take it for granted.[22]

The situation Grant describes amounts to a state of war for a large percentage of the earth's population. The sense of powerlessness and apathy that accompanies the acceptance of these conditions, according to liberation theologian Blase Bonpane, is a myth. He writes: "The greatest single myth of our culture is the concept of powerlessness. We are not powerless. It is incumbent on us to demonstrate the power we have through mass mobilization and organization." [Peacemaking, Bonpane says,] "is never passive. Peacemaking means conflict with what Jesus called the world."[23] Peacemaking, in this sense, works from the bottom up, through popular movements which are "calling into question first of all the economic, social, and political order that oppresses and marginalizes them [the oppressed] and of course the ideology that is brought in to justify this domination."[24]

Peacemaking, in this view, also works from the inside out. However, for many people, "A spiritual experience . . . should be something out beyond the frontiers of human realities as profane and tainted as politics."[25] But this concept of peace "is not a purely interior, private attitude, but it is a process occurring in the socio-economic, political, and cultural milieu in which we live, and which we ought to transform."[26] Peacemakers, in this sense, are those who demonstrated for civil rights, opposed "the war in Vietnam, the draft, nuclear war, and the genocide in Central America. These are the peacemakers."[27] This concept of peace works from the bottom up and from the inside out.

Paradigm One: Peace From the Inside Out

Liberation theologians, as peacemakers, remind us that:

> What is really at stake, then, is not simply a greater rationality in economic activity, or a better social organization, but over and above all this, justice and love. To be sure, these classic concepts do not often come up in the language of political science. But there is no avoiding them here. And this demonstrates the human depth and density of the matter with which we are dealing . . . . The praxis of liberation, therefore, inasmuch as it starts out from an authentic solidarity with the poor and the oppressed, is ultimately a praxis of love--real love, effective and concrete, for real, concrete human beings.[28]

This sense of peace and solidarity emerges from a praxis that is based on the forces at work in a particular cultural context.

In North America one might take an entirely different view. In fact, "Attention to the oppressed in careful exclusion of the kinds of cosmic problems which may preclude the possibility of all liberation and all oppression, even all life, is a prime example of fiddling while the world burns."[29] This sense of peace making can not be restricted to particular cases of oppression but must be generalized to include "major cosmic problems." The major "cosmic" problems that come to my mind were included in a statement made by the World Commission on Environment and Development which I quoted in the introduction to this thesis. The Commission notes that the world's problems can no longer be "compartmentalized within nations, within sectors (energy, agriculture, trade) and within broad areas of concern (environmental, economic, social)." These compartments, they point out, "have begun to dissolve . . . . They are not separate crises: an environmental crisis, a developmental crisis, they are all one."[30] They result from an instrumental view of each other and of our environment. Within this view, global problems become compartmentalized; human life (which could be extended to include all forms of life) is objectified and as a result often exploited. Peace, in this view, is seen as the absence of war. It is achieved and maintained through strength: by being armed with bigger and better weapons than "the other side." The notion of "the other side" is problematic and assumes that one nation's actions —such as resource exploitation to fuel an escalating arms race—are not intimately connected to the poverty and oppression that scars much of the globe.

Paradigm Two: Peace From the Top Down (Peace Through Strength)

The arms race is life-threatening in many ways. For example,

> Demands on the public purse are its most visible sign. There it is in direct competition with the urgent requirements of a growing population for such basic needs as an adequate diet, health support, environmental protection, the education and training that are central to the development process.[31]

This situation was also recognized by Immanuel Kant in 1795. He wrote, "Our world rulers at present have no money left over for public education and for anything that concerns what is best in the world, since all they have is already committed to future wars . . . ."[32] But I wonder if Kant could have foreseen the extent to which the military sector dominates the global economy. Ruth Sivard points out that:

> The robust expansion of the world's military sector stands in sharp contrast to the signs of growing economic-social malaise and political instability. Economic growth has slowed. The share of public revenues available for essential social needs is shrinking. Public unrest is on the rise. It is difficult to find among today's most pressing issues any that lend themselves to military solutions. In this sense military power seems to be irrelevant to national and global security.[33]

This conclusion is not reflected in current military strategy. In fact, world military expenditures for the developed and the developing world continue to climb while many nations cut needed social programs.[34]

In this view, peace is seen as the absence of war. Proponents of this view point to the periods of relative peace that most of the world has enjoyed since World War II. But how valid is this view? If one looks beyond the superpowers or major industrial nations, does this view hold true?

In a study of wars and war-related deaths between 1700 and 1987, Ruth Sivard points to some surprising statistics. For example,

> Twenty-two wars were underway in 1987, more wars than in any previous year in recorded history. The total death toll in these wars so far is at least 2,200,000—and rising fast. Incredibly, many more civilians than soldiers are victims; civilians account for 84 percent of recorded deaths.[35]

War is defined as "any armed conflict which includes one or more governments and causes deaths of 1000 or more per year." Of the total war deaths since 1700, over 90 percent belong to the 20th century.[36] Clearly this period cannot be called peaceful. In fact, 1987 had 22 war-scarred battlefields to its credit. The rise of civilian deaths during this period is most alarming and bears stark testimony to the horrors inflicted on innocent civilians. In the 1960's for example—not known as one of the most peaceful periods the world has seen—civilian deaths accounted for 52 percent of the total war dead. In the 1970's, 73 percent; for the 1980's (up to 1987), civilians account for 85 percent of the total war dead.[37] These wars have not, as has traditionally been the case, been fought on European soil. For the most part they have been fought in the Third World with the involvement of the major powers. This involvement has often been of an indirect and covert nature. In 1981, for example, "the director of the CIA proposed covert support to pro-US forces in Nicaragua, Afghanistan, Laos, Cambodia, Grenada, Iran, Libya, and Cuba."[38] Major powers do not always restrict their support to one side in a conflict. The USSR, for example, "by far the largest supplier to Iraq according to USG [United States Government statistics] has also furnished SAM-7 surface to air missiles to Iran."[39] Can this situation be called peaceful?

The answer to this question hinges on how we define peace. If peace is defined—as it was at a recent conference on peace education—then the above statistics are easily justified. David Code, spokesman for the Canadian Department of National Defense, put it this way:

> In my definition of peace I want to include more than the absence of war. Peace, to me, must include the freedom and security to which I have become accustomed. It must allow me to live my life free from the fear of being attacked by someone from the other side.[40]

This definition is problematic. The concepts of peace, freedom, and security are based on fear. Peace, in this view, often depends on negotiations and business deals made by an elite and given to or imposed upon the masses. This view of peace often underlies the justification for military expenditures.

Peace in this view depends on being armed with bigger and better weapons than "the other side." The notion of "the other side" involves "them" as opposed to "us." This definition of peace bears a striking similarity to the concept of Pax Romana: peace for the in-group at the expense of the out-group, or peace in the countries of the major powers while they support conflicts in the Third World. This support often takes place for reasons of peace and security.

But this definition of peace and security is lacking in many ways. The notion of "them" and "us" does not encourage a view of the world that can bring an end to the structural violence, oppression, and poverty that is often inflicted upon marginalized groups in the First and Third Worlds. Kazim Bacchus put it this way:

> Many groups have been trying to make governments more sensitive to the impact of their actions on the global economy . . . . We can no longer escape from the miseries that face other members of this planet . . . .[41]

Peace, from within the third paradigm of peace making, is not seen as a solution to global problems such as war, ecological balance, and social injustice. Peace, in this view, represents a way of seeking solutions. This concept of peace is underpinned by values of social justice, environmental care, and cultural solidarity. These values promote non-violence and a sense of global responsibility that recognizes the interconnections and interrelationships which make up our global society. These values are based on a view of the world that considers "us" to be a part of "them" and allows us to see "ourselves as a part of, not apart from, our planet and all its inhabitants."[42] In this way, the struggle for peace becomes the responsibility of each one of us; and peace-making becomes peace-building.

However, when peace is defined as the absence of war, the struggle for peace takes place in diplomatic circles and is often blind to the misery and oppression which face other members of the planet. Peacemaking is placed out of the reach and power of the great majority. This situation is compared to peace under the balance of deterrence, maintained through bilateral agreements, arms control treaties, and summit conferences.

Peace built on deterrence is peace based on terror. Michael Walzer puts it this way: "Deterrence works by calling up dramatic images of human pain."[43] Nuclear weapons, in this sense, seem passive: that is, their only role is to deter the enemy. In keeping with the concept of nuclear deterrence, each nation must ensure that:

> A sufficient number of nuclear weapons must be maintained in the arsenals, so that--if attacked--enough weapons will survive to ensure causing unacceptable damage in a retaliatory attack. This is the strategy of deterrence, the cornerstone of the security of many states.[44]

What does this strategy mean for the major powers? Consider the United States or the Soviet Union for example. If a nuclear strike was made, as it very well could be, against one country's industrial and population centers involving between three to five thousand warheads, the resulting death and destruction, as James Sterba points out, "could destroy between 70-80% of each nation's industry and result in the immediate death of as many as 165 million Americans and 100 million Russians."[45] This action would very likely involve a retaliatory nuclear strike by the opposing superpower. It has been estimated by Carl Sagan and others that such a strike would create "nuclear winter" and threaten the survival of the human species.[46] Nuclear weapons, Walzer writes, "explode the theory of just war."[47] Any use, particularly the massive use, of nuclear weapons would result in the death of large numbers of innocent people and stretch the flexible just war doctrine beyond its moral limits. Can peace be based on the terror of deterrence or the threat of death to innocent civilians? Is there an end that would justify such means?

This sense of peace presupposes that the pursuit of peace is achieved through the control of direct violence, that the pursuit of peace belongs in the hands of state elites and is realized through policies such as nuclear deterrence. This route to peace "works through existing structures and does not attempt to transform them."[48] These institutional structures depend on centralized power; they allow elites to make major decisions which affect the lives of millions of "other" people. These decisions and their implications are then imposed on the majority of the population, imposed from the top down. As I have argued in the previous chapter, this concept of peacemaking was dominant up until the mid-1950's and early 1960's. Up until that time, it seemed inevitable that the responsibility for peace was firmly rooted in the policies and actions of state officials, firmly rooted in a paradigm two approach to peacemaking.

Paradigm Three: Peace From the Bottom Up

However, with the emergence of a paradigm three approach to peacemaking, it has become increasingly obvious that the ordinary citizen can understand complicated issues. Ordinary citizens, through popular movements (peace movements, people's revolutions, movements for aboriginal rights, and ecology movements), have begun to question a top down concept of peace and security. For example, the ecological movement in recent years has gained prominence in many parts of the world. The movement is of significant importance and could very well be the catalyst which ushers in a new sense of security, one that is based on the health of the planet and the human family rather than on the number of nuclear warheads in our stockpile. United States Senator Hubert Humphrey recognized this situation in 1976. He wrote:

> When we discuss national security, we tend too often to give it a military label. It is, in fact, much broader than military power and much more complex. There can be no security without a commitment to social betterment.[49]

Top down policies of nuclear deterrence, arms control, and bilateral agreements lull many people into a false sense of security and result in a fragmented view of peace. "Today's world calls for a new global vision, one less diverted by military fantasies and more attuned to the realities of human needs."[50] When the world is viewed through the lens of state security and the resulting fragmented concept of peace, peace building is left in the hands of the powerful minority.

Peace building for the powerful minority takes place in diplomatic circles and is often blind to the misery and oppression facing other members of the planet. The struggle for peace, in this view, is placed out of the reach and power of the great majority.

Peace Building

From within the third paradigm, peace is not understood as a solution to global problems of war, ecological balance, and social injustice but as a way of seeking solutions. Peace, in this view, is more than the absence of war. Of course the elimination of war is central to any concept of peace, but it must go hand-in-hand with the elimination of other problems such as racism, poverty, alienation, and environmental degradation. Peace builders, in this view, work for the elimination of violence, both direct and structural. The direct violence in war is most obvious and a concern of everyone. Structural violence, however, is more subtle and often built into the social structure. It prevents the realization of human potential and is often used to maintain an unjust social system.

Peace, from within the third paradigm, is based on a richer sense of peace than of paradigm one--from the inside out--or paradigm two--from the top down. Paradigm three is a movement for peace that works from the bottom up—but it must also work from the inside out and the top down. It is a peace that is based on the absence of war and the realization of social and international justice. It is revolutionary in the sense that peace builders from within this paradigm work for the elimination of direct and structural violence. Paradigm three peace builders realize that a "top down" or an "inside out" approach to peace is not enough. A focus on either one of these views results in a fragmented sense of peace. If one strives for inner peace and is not moved to action for peace and liberation on the social plane, one's sense of peace becomes fragmented. Can we separate individual liberation from the plight of the world's poor and oppressed or from the major global problems that threaten the survival of the human species? F. E. Trainer points to ~~the~~ interconnected nature of these problems. He writes:

> The problems of resource scarcity, energy scarcity, nuclear energy, environmental destruction, Third World poverty and underdevelopment, internal conflict and the quality of life are not separate; they are different manifestations of the one basic problem. That problem is our commitment to affluent lifestyles and to an economic system that cannot tolerate the pursuit of anything less.[51]

Can we have peace in our hearts while our lifestyle depends on the domination of the impoverished by an affluent minority? This domination is not restricted to the plight of the starving millions in the Third World. The number of homeless and unemployed in many North American cities continues to climb while economies experience healthy rates of growth. These contradictions are subject to serious enquiry in peace education programs. Many of these programs are based on a broad definition of peace and promote enquiry into the roots of structural violence. Peace educators ask, for example, why "every day 15,000 people fall in the war of rich against poor. 'The bombs [for them] are falling now' as the American peace movement puts it."[52] One cannot call these conditions peaceful. If we really want peace, we must take on the responsibility of being peace builders.

Peace as Action

In the third paradigm of peace making, peace is not defined as absence, by stating what it is not. Peace resists definition because it is part of a dynamic social process in which we all play a part. Thus it becomes one's personal responsibility to live in peace for peace. In this view, there is no way to peace; peace is the way.[53] It is not a state we reach but an activity in which we engage.

This view of peace as action underlies the third paradigm of peace making which, mixed with action, becomes peace building. Pope Paul VI on the 1979 World Day of Peace underscored this point when he said, "We shall achieve peace preparing for peace."[54] Pope Paul did not intend to negate the tradition of Pax Christi, and he acknowledged this when he said, "Yes peace is born inside human hearts. Peace has to be first of all known, then recognized and it is only then that one can desire it and love it."[55] To achieve peace, preparing for peace according to Pope Paul involves the whole of humanity. He puts it this way: "It is whole humanity which is to be an object of such preparation for peace. Therefore, this appeal is directed not only to those who believe in God but to all people of good will."[56] Pope Paul's broad understanding of peace involves a reorientation of attitudes and values. This sense of peace is underpinned by values of social justice, environmental care, cultural solidarity, and is nurtured by an emerging sense of global responsibility.

Social Justice

Social justice, as an emergent value of peace building, is an important component of economic well being. Social injustice, on the other hand, is often a product of structural violence and results in the oppression and marginalization of large numbers of people. This form of violence limits human potential. To help bring an end to structural violence and cultivate social justice, the oppressed must be able to free their consciousness from the shackles of domination and participate in the creation of a peaceful society. The oppressed, as Paulo Freire points out, "in seeking to regain their humanity (which is a way to create it)," must not "become oppressors of the oppressors, but rather restorers of the humanity of both,"[57] thus making the transition from objects in the historical process to subjects participating in the creation of a peaceful world. The resulting process of peace building can work from the bottom up and the inside out. When this struggle works in concert with top down policies, significant legislative advances like the civil rights legislation passed in the United States during the 1960's can be realized. When this process of peace building conflicts with rigid top down policies, as happened most recently in China, direct violence can be the result. Whatever the result, once the process has begun the creation of a more peaceful society is underway.

Environmental Care

The violence of environmental destruction scars the globe. The policies and practices that contribute to this destruction are placing demands on the world's ecosystem that are beyond its carrying capacity. This process is manifested in deforestration, climatic change, the pollution of lakes and rivers, and many other symptoms of environmental violence. The process of destruction threatens the existence of the human species and demands a concept of security that is not based on nuclear weapons or on fear but on an awareness of the interconnected nature of human actions and their environmental consequences. For example, "Nuclear insecurity, world economic instability, over-population, climatic dislocation, and pollution of air and ocean threaten the most predictable parts of our daily lives."[58] This situation is brought about when individual interests within and between nations take precedence over the health of the world and its people. In this way we risk not just war but serious environmental collapse. Chief Seattle, in 1895, explained the problem in this way. He said:

> Whatever befalls the earth befalls the sons of the earth; if men spit upon the ground, they spit upon themselves. This we know—the earth does not belong to man, man belongs to the earth. All things are connected like the blood which unites

> one family. Whatever befalls the earth befalls the sons of the earth. Man did not weave the web of life; he is merely a strand in it. Whatever he does to the web he does to himself.[59]

Almost one hundred years later—as if Chief Seattle had come back to haunt us—the following points were made in Gaia—An Atlas of Planet Management:

> As we over-stress the natural resource base of our planet, we set up strains and tensions that lead to fractures in our societies. Often, these environmental "breaking points" trigger conflicts both within and between nations. The problem of security has outgrown the reach of the nation state. No nation of people can be secure if the planet itself is insecure. The vital interests of nations extend to the basic systems of the earth itself.[60]

Thus the value of environmental care forms a central part of the third paradigm of peace building.

Cultural Solidarity

Cultural solidarity is part of the third paradigm of peace building. This value, like the values of social justice and environmental care, is based on an awareness of the interconnectedness of all things. But awareness of our place in an interconnected world is not enough. Awareness becomes part of the peace building process when it is reinforced with action. Cultural solidarity is the expression of "a spirit of intercultural trust, empathy, respect and understanding in plural societies where different cultures must learn to live together in peace."[61] Solidarity can be supported with action in many ways. Recall the actions of the early Quakers, for example. In the introduction to this thesis, they were identified with the first paradigm of peace making, peace from the inside out. The Quakers, by displaying "an outflow of love for their fellowmen, whether heathen Indian or Christians belonging to 'enemy' nations," practiced the essence of cultural solidarity.[62]

In 1989--operating from within what I have defined as a paradigm three approach to peace building--the Quakers took direct action in support of cultural solidarity. This action was manifested in the presence of Quakers standing side-by-side with the Cree people of Lubiçon Lake, standing in non-violent support of the Lubicons' position in a well-known land dispute with the Canadian government. This bottom up or grass roots support was reinforced by an attempt to influence top down action. In a letter to Prime Minister Brian Mulroney, Quaker Isabel Shawler wrote:

> Canadian Friends Service Committee is the social justice and peace arm of the Religious Society of Friends (Quakers) in Canada. We have been involved in aboriginal justice issues for over 20 years. . . .
>
> We again urge all members of parliament to act immediately to ensure that this matter [the dispute between the Lubicon Cree and the federal government] is justly resolved. Resolution must include adequate compensation for the Lubicon and the resources to enable them to become economically self-sustaining . . . .
>
> We request information regarding action you may take to move conflict towards resolution.[63]

Quaker action for peace through cultural solidarity also includes a concern for environmental care and a sense of global responsibility. In India, for example,

> The Indian Quakers, who run the Friends Rural Center in Madhya Pradesh, decided to stop using inorganic fertilizers and pesticides eight years ago. . . . They strive to use techniques available to the "impoverished small farmer." For example, the center sold its tractor and returned to using traditional bullock teams . . . . This outlook reflects the view that the deteriorating Indian environment must be dealt with by "drastic changes in Indian society and values."[64]

Quaker action for peace works from the inside out, from the top down, and from the bottom up. This broad approach to peace building is exemplary of a paradigm three approach to a peaceful world. In this view, peace is understood to be an essential characteristic of a dynamic social process that is built on and manifests the values of social justice, environmental care, and cultural solidarity. These values, however, form part of a value system that includes love, truth, harmony, and a fundamental respect for human dignity. Love forms the essence of an inner sense of peace in which truth is sought through open and widespread attempts to understand social reality. The harmony that characterizes a paradigm three approach to peace building is found in efforts to transcend the exploitation and oppression that results from an instrumental view of the world. An examination of these approaches to peace form part of many contemporary peace education programs. In many of these programs, peace is defined in the broad sense and is concerned with empowerment of the learner. However, the cultivation of peace in the broad sense and a paradigm three approach to peace building remain possible "if, and only if, we can raise questions in others' minds."[65]

Chapter III Endnotes

[1] T. Witvliet, A Place in the Sun (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1984), p. 22.

[2] Ibid., p. 21.

[3] Ibid., p. 129.

[4] G. Lagos, "The Revolution of Being," in The Creation of a Just World Order, ed. S. H. Mendlovitz (New York: The Free Press, 1975), pp. 82-83.

[5] G. Gutierrez, The Power of the Poor in History (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1983), p. 22.

[6] Ibid., p. 191.

[7] D. W. Fern, Third World Liberation Theologies (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1986), p. 1.

[8] C. K. Wilber, "First Latin American Encounter of Christians for Socialism," in The Political Economy of Underdevelopment, ed. C. K. Wilber (New York: Random House Books, 1979), p. 391.

[9] Ibid.

[10] Ibid., p. 398.

[11] R. Falk, "Document: Openings for Peace and Justice in a World of Danger and Struggle," Alternatives: A Journal of World Policy, XIII, 1988, p. 141.

[12] Ibid., pp. 137-152.

[13] E. Cardenal, "Revolution and Peace: The Nicaraguan Road," Journal of Peace Research, XVIII, No. 2, 1981, p. 201.

[14] P. D. Scott, "Towards a Transpolitics: The Role of the Peace Educator," in Peace Education and the Task of the Peace Educator, eds. T. R. Carson and H. D. Gideonse (NP: World Council for Curriculum and Instruction, 1987), p. 91.

[15] V. J. Genovesi, S.J., "The Just War Doctrine: A Warrant for Resistance," The Thomist, 45, No. 3, 1981, p. 507.

[16] St. Augustine, De Cev. Dei, IV, in J. Kondziela, "Catholic Perspectives on Life in Peace," Bulletin of Peace Proposals, 18, No. 3, 1987, p. 416.

[17] Pope Pius XII, Catholic Mind 55 (1967), p. 176, cited in Genovesi, p. 529.

[18] Pope Paul VI, *Populorum Progressio*, sections 31 and 81, cited in B. Bonpane, *Guerrillas of Peace* (Boston: South End Press, 1985), p. 4.

[19] G. Gutierrez, *A Theology of Liberation* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1973), p. 34.

[20] Gutierrez, *The Power of the Poor in History*, p. 201.

[21] Ibid., p. 192.

[22] J. Grant, cited in "Survival and Solidarity: Australia and Third World (South) Peace." Toh Swee-Hin, *Social Alternatives*, 6, No. 2, p. 59.

[23] B. Bonpane, *Guerrillas of Peace* (Boston: South End Press, 1985), p. 79.

[24] Gutierrez, *The Power of the Poor in History*, p. 91.

[25] Ibid., p. 52.

[26] Ibid., p. 53.

[27] Bonpane, p. 81.

[28] Gutierrez, *The Power of the Poor in History*, p. 50.

[29] P. Lakeland, "Process and Revolution," *Process Studies*, 15, No. 4, p. 267.

[30] World Commission on Environment and Development, *Our Common Future* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), p. 3.

[31] R. L. Sivard, *World Military and Social Expenditures 1987-1988* (Washington, D.C.: World Priorities, 1987), p. 6.

[32] I. Kant. *On History*, trans. Beck et al. (Indianapolis: Bobbs Merrill, 1963), p. 23.

[3] Sivard, p. 21.

[34] Ibid., pp. 23, 42.

[35] Ibid., p. 28.

[36] Ibid.

[37] Ibid.

[38] Ibid., p. 11.

[39] Ibid.

[40] D. Code, "Is Canada Becoming Militarized?" Perspectives on Peace and Security, ed. N. Kach (Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1988), p. 1.

[41] K. Bacchus, "The Concept of Global Education," ATA Magazine, May/June, 1989, p. 21.

[42] B. Reardon, Comprehensive Peace Education (New York: Teachers' College Press, 1988), p. 60.

[43] M. Walzer, Just and Unjust Wars (New York: Basic Books, 1977), p. 269.

[44] J. Rotblat, "Peace and Disarmament," Bulletin of Peace Proposals, 18, No. 3, pp. 244-245.

[45] J. P. Sterba, "Between MAD and Counter Force: Sound Nuclear Defence Policy," Social Theory and Practice, 12, No. 2, p. 176.

[46] Ibid., p. 179.

[47] Walzer, p. 282.

[48] B. Martin, "The Limits of the Peace Movement," Our Generation, 17, No. 2, p. 16.

[49] H. Humphrey, cited in World History and Social Expenditures. Ruth Sivard, p. 7.

[50] Sivard, p. 7.

[51] F. E. Trainer, Abandon Affluence, 2 ed. (London: Zed Books, 1985), p. 11.

[52] D. Solle, "God and the Bomb--Religious Dimensions of the New Peace Movement," Dialectics and Humanism, IX, No. 4, p. 17.

[53] G. Cox, The Ways of Peace (New York: Paulist Press, 1986), p. 194.

[54] J. Kondriela, "The Social Dimensions of Preparation for Peace," Dialectics and Humanism, IX, No. 4, p. 49.

[55] Ibid., p. 50.

[56] Ibid.

[57] P. Freire, Pedagogy of the Oppressed, trans. M. B. Ramos (New York: Continum, 1987), p. 28.

[58] "Crisis: The Threat of War," in Gaia An Atlas of Planet Management, ed. N. Myers (Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1984), p. 243.

[59] Ibid., p. 159

[60] Gaia, p. 242.

[61] S. H. Toh and V. Floresca-Cawagas, Peace Education (Quezon City: Phoenix, 1987), p. 21.

[62] P. Brock, Pacifism in the United States (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980), p. 27.

[63] Letter from Isabel Shawler, Canadian Friends Service Committee, to Brian Mulroney, Prime Minister of Canada, March 28, 1989.

[64] T. L. Green, "Organic Farming in India," Alternatives: Perspectives on Society, Technology and Environment, 15, No. 1, p. 46.

[65] Cox, p. 172.

CHAPTER IV: PEACE EDUCATION: A CONTRAST OF PERSPECTIVES

Introduction

What one means by the term "peace education" is determined by one's conception of peace. In the previous chapter, a variety of approaches to peace were identified and explored. These approaches and their underlying assumptions have determined the character and content of many peace education programs.

Debates among peace researchers have focused on the nature of peace, on peace studies, and on definitions of peace. Instead of being defined as the mere absence of war (negative peace), it was felt that peace should involve cooperation and non-violent social change aimed at creating more equitable and just structures in a society (positive peace).[1] Peace education was influenced by those debates and is informed by the academic discipline of peace research. "Peace research" can be defined as:

> a multidisciplinary applied science concerned with investigating both policy related war/peace issues of the day and longer term questions about urgent military, political and social problems facing "Spaceship Earth" . . . . Increasingly, however, the field of peace research has become more holistic in relation to the systematic study of various forms of violence within and between societies.[2]

More simply put, peace research is an academic discipline that "re-searches" the problems of peace and informs peace studies programs.

"Peace studies" is a term used to describe specific courses and programs relating to war and peace issues. Peace studies are offered at colleges and universities around the world. The evolution in peace studies curricula has been interdisciplinary, holistic, process-oriented, relevant, and controversial. In the editor's note to the fourth edition of the 700-page Peace and World Order Studies curriculum guide, Barbara J. Wien points out that the previous three editions "have been used by over 6000 college, university and secondary school educators in 42 countries. . . ."[3]

The growth of peace education has been experienced internationally. It is informed by the work of peace researchers and reinforced through peace studies programs. The interdisciplinary and cross-curricular concerns of peace education are a result of the interconnectedness of humanity and human action. Peace education, then, is an area of study based on the perspectives and approaches of several academic disciplines. Many peace education programs deal with issues and problems that threaten the survival of the human species. The development of these programs is the result of educational responses to global problems.

For some peace educators, the possibility of nuclear war represents the most significant threat to human survival. The threat, proponents of this view assume, exists because of the nuclear arms race. Arms races, they point out, cause wars. These assumptions underlie the form of peace education known as "nuclear education." Nuclear education is education for negative peace. It has resulted in the creation of curriculum units by groups such as Educators for Social Responsibility,[4] major films such as If You Love This Planet, and national and international organizations--such as Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War--who won the 1984 UNESCO Peace Education Prize and the 1985 Nobel Peace Prize.[5]

Disarmament education rests on the same assumptions as nuclear education. This educational approach to negative peace extends to all arms: conventional, nuclear, and other weapons of mass destruction. The emphasis is on the links between arms production and armed conflict. Ian Harris puts it this way:

> Based upon the principles of the United Nations Charter, disarmament education attempts to provide an awareness of the consequences of armaments upon human communities. It teaches about the cost of the arms race, educates about arms control efforts, and provides an awareness of the production and use of weapons.[6]

The questions raised through disarmament education naturally lead to an inquiry into the links between arms production and the militarization of "developed" and "underdeveloped" nations.

Development education emerged in a wave of concern over decolonization and Third World development in the post-colonial period. The publication of the 1980 Brant Report, North South, underlined the interdependent nature of Third World problems and fueled an interest in development education.[7] Through concern with problems of underdevelopment, starvation, poverty, illiteracy, and the lack of human rights, development education provides an awareness of the political and economic conditions that contribute to structurally violent situations in many Third World countries.[8]

The urgency of Third World problems asks peace educators to reconsider their focus on nuclear war. This focus, peace educators from the Third World claim, is a privilege that is restricted to those in the First World. Educator Ram Chandra Pradhan explains:

> There has been too much obsession with the threat of nuclear weapons and inter-state war. In the Third World, the problems of hunger, malnutrition, underdevelopment, social injustice and terror are much more important and they contribute more to the eruption of violence both at national and transnational levels.[9]

Thus the focus of development education is on positive peace and on the roots of direct and structural violence. This form of violence, many peace educators claim, is at the root of human rights abuses.

Development education and human rights education are interrelated. "Typically, human rights educators base their teaching programmes and strategies upon the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948)."[10] Their concern is with national and international human rights and their violation.

One of the unifying strands in peace education programs is the struggle to reduce or eliminate violence—direct and structural. Non-violent change is at the heart of peace education. Peace educators argue that the violence humans inflict on each other is equalled by the violence inflicted on the environment. Thus environmental education is a form of peace education.

The initial impulse of the "new" environmental education was fueled by the fear that the "advanced industrial nations," through what was perceived as irresponsible and unlimited growth, were destroying the planet. These fears were reinforced by the projection of the Club of Rome and other environmental groups such as the Friends of the Earth. On April 20, 1970, "a generation dedicated itself to reclaiming the planet."[11] Earth Day 1970 symbolized the growing concern over environmental problems. In organizing for Earth Day, the staff of Environmental Action, one of the "new" environmental organizations, "served as the national coordinating office for local groups on 2000 campuses, in 2000 communities and in 10,000 high schools" throughout the United States.[12] This and other educational responses gave "Environmental Studies" a new meaning--transcending the geographical and nature studies of the school's immediate locality to "an examination of Spaceship Earth's life-support system."[13] This global persepctive is found in the work of educators from many parts of the world.

The Dimensions of Peace Education: From America

The concerns of development educators, human rights educators, and environmental educators can be seen as education for positive peace. They promote non-violence and a fundamental respect for human dignity. However, not all educators in these areas would consider themselves peace educators. According to Betty Reardon:

> Whether a curriculum in any of these areas [development, human rights, and environmental education] can be classified as peace education depends on its value content and its treatment of core problems addressed by peace education: violence.[14]

"Violence" is here defined as:

> intentional and avoidable damage to life, or injury to life-sustaining or life-enhancing elements of the environment or social structures. [Thus] . . . the environment, particularly when conceived as a living ecological system, can be the object of violence.[15]

The value content of education for positive peace is reflected in the work of Betty Reardon, Director of the Peace Education Program of Teachers' College, Columbia University. Reardon has been active for many years in the development of peace education. She has been widely published and was one of the founders of the Peace Education Commission of the International Peace Research Association.

For Reardon and other peace educators, the core values of comprehensive peace education (which includes the concepts of positive and negative peace) are grounded in the value of integrity. Reardon defines integrity according to the Oxford English Dictionary: "unbroken wholeness without unnecessary division" and then completes the definition by adding "in harmony with a larger wholeness." By this she means "that human integrity in individual persons is related to and part of a social integrity that would permit us to live without doing violence to each other, to other groups, or to our environment, our parent planet."[16] Integrity based on a sense of wholeness, relationship to others, and to the natural order implies wholism as opposed to fragmentation. This sense of wholeness, Reardon writes,

> requires that integrity becomes a major educational goal. . . . Integrity as an educational goal calls for peace education

> to be grounded in the three comprehensive core values that I have termed planetary stewardship, global citizenship, and humane relationship.[17]

These values call on peace educators to foster certain qualities in their students. Planetary stewardship "calls on us to foster in our students a consciousness of their relationship to the whole natural order."[18] The relationship entails a sense of responsibility to the well-being and long-term survival of the planet. Stewardship, Reardon claims, "should be a fundamental value of all education, but most particularly of peace education."[19]

The value of global citizenship is based on creating a non-violent, just social order. This global social order should offer equity to all the earth's people. It includes protecting universal human rights, protecting the planet, and "providing for the resolution of conflict by non-violent means."[20]

Humane relationship is a value that leads to the awareness of the "interconnections and interrelationships that make up the web of life."[21] This sense of relationship implies the responsibility of striving for the transcendence of direct and structural violence. It calls on people (particularly peace educators) to work for a social order that fosters rather than restricts the development of human potential.

The Dimensions of Peace Education: From Great Britain

David Hicks, Director of the Center for Peace Studies, St. Martin's College, Lancaster, identified the promotion of non-violence, economic welfare, social justice, ecological balance, and participation as values "which must underpin any definition of peace."[22] He writes:

> The overall aim of educating for peace is thus to develop the skills, attitudes and knowledge necessary to resolve conflict peacefully in order to work towards a more just and less violent world.[23]

Although, as Hicks points out, "education for peace comes in different forms in different parts of the world,"[24] one can identify common threads.

In Europe, where the lessons of two World Wars have illustrated the tragic consequences of national hatred, education for peace is education for international understanding. In India, education for peace finds its roots in the Gandhian tradition of satyagraha and non-violence. Gandhi defines "satyagraha" this way: "the doctrine came to mean vindication of truth not by infliction of suffering on the opponent but on one's self."[25] Self-suffering, Gandhi maintained, if undertaken in the proper spirit, would enable opponents to "see" (come to understand) the rightness of moral principles in a way that would win their free and uncoerced consent.[26]

The Dimensions of Peace Education: From The Philippines

Toh Swee-Hin and Virginia Floresca-Cawagas developed a framework for peace education in the Philippines. Toh Swee-Hin teaches and researches in peace and development education at the University of New England, Armidale, NSW, Australia. He is active internationally in the development of peace education programs and serves on the Board of the World Council for Curriculum and Instruction (WCCI). Virginia Floresca-Cawagas is former Executive Director of the Catholic Education Association of the Philippines and has been active in the WCCI. Her research interests include values education and peace education.

The framework for peace education in the Philippines focuses on six issues. These issues, the authors hope, "will encourage Filipinos, engaged in all levels and types of educational activities, to contribute towards active nonviolent peacebuilding in this country through education."[27] The issues of militarization, structural violence, human rights, cultural solidarity, environmental care, and personal peace are intended to address the problems of peacelessness in the Philippine context; but their relevance transcends national boundaries.

Militarization includes both the problem of disarmament and nuclear issues. It is not contained within local boundaries and threatens the survival of the human species. The issue of militarization raises questions that focus on arms exports to Third World countries and the resulting military repression. Enquiry into problems of militarization begs the question: whose interests are being served by over-militarization?[28]

Structural violence is of particular concern to Filipino peace educators. "There is no doubt that Filipino society, as it has 'developed' and modernized since Spanish, then American domination, is deeply affected by structural violence." While a small Filipino elite amass wealth and power, "some 400 Filipino children die daily from hunger-related diseases. . . ."[29] These problems are a direct concern of the peace educator.

However, the problems of structural violence, poverty, and the violation of human rights are not restricted to the Third World. These problems are a burden for many people in the First World. The numbers of homeless and unemployed in many North American cities continues to climb while economies experience healthy rates of growth. Many of the manifestations of structural violence are addressed in development education and human rights education programs.

The issue of human rights is directly related to the previous issues of militarization and structural violence. In the Philippines, the abuse of human rights "has inflicted suffering upon Filipinos from all walks of life, but in particular the poor and those citizens who courageously struggled to resist political repression."[30] Peace educators, therefore, have an urgent responsibility to raise questions of human rights abuses so that the next generation of Filipinos are more prepared to defend their rights to be free from repression and oppression and to enjoy adequate livelihoods and basic needs.[31]

The issue of human rights, like the issues of militarization and structural violence, is not just a Filipino concern. These problems, global in nature, demand the attention of peace educators around the world.

Peace education, Toh Swee-Hin and Floresca-Cawagas maintain, should focus on development issues and examine the pros and cons of many uncritically accepted social, political, and economic practices. These practices often result in the exploitation of minority groups by the dominant majority. Thus peace education is concerned with cultural solidarity. Cultural solidarity expresses the "spirit of intercultural trust, empathy, respect and understanding in plural societies where different cultures must learn to live together in peace."[32] The concept of cultural solidarity includes a respect for human rights and would question development policies which result in exploitation. Questions of racism and prejudice are important issues for the peace educator and run counter to the notion of cultural solidarity. Cultural solidarity is an issue of global and local dimensions.

Respect for other cultures, respect for human rights, and respect for the natural environment are at the core of peace education. Toh Swee-Hin and Floresca-Cawagas write:

> Ultimately, peace education for environmental care seeks to foster the value of abandoning norms of excessive consumption and profit maximization which underlie the global environment crisis.
>
> In the Philippines, issues and questions of environmental destruction or mismanagement ought to occupy a vital role in peace education.[33]

The peace educator must question economic policies that result in environmental damage. "Development" projects such as the destruction of the rainforests of Brazil to make way for cattle ranches illustrate the irony that often accompanies the use of the term "development." For example, the tropical forests are destroyed and their human inhabitants displaced, driven off, infected with disease, or in some cases shot in order to "develop" their forest homes and turn the treeless land into cattle ranches.[34]

Environmental destruction is not restricted to the Third World. Logging practices in North America are, in many cases, inconsistent with the issue of environmental care. The violence of environmental destruction is often acutely felt by Canada's native people. Their culture and way of life was, and for many still is, tied to the natural world. Environmental destruction is a major factor in the destruction of traditional cultures. Many environmental problems such as those of the tropical rainforests, the logging of northern forests, the pollution of clogged lakes and rivers in the industrialized world, industrial accidents such as the horror of Chernobyl or the Bhopal gas tragedy cause untold suffering to many while vast profits accrue in the accounts of the few. The peace educator must also be an environmental educator. Every year, increasing numbers of scientists and concerned people communicate the urgency of environmental problems to the general population: problems that threaten the survival of life as we know it. The peace educator, then, must cultivate a deep understanding of these diverse yet interconnected problems with a sense of personal peace that places them within a holistic framework.

The peace educator must face the fragmentation and alienation of contemporary culture squarely and with compassion. Toh Swee-Hin and Floresca-Cawagas put it this way:

> In rich or poor societies, the spread of advanced industrial culture has been accompanied by considerable personal alienation. This is manifested in various forms of addictions (e.g. drugs, alcoholism) or disease of stress and affluence (e.g. neurosis) which may lead to suicides and other forms of personal, domestic, and social violence.[35]

In the Philippines, they point out, peace education "requires a component devoted to helping learners develop personal harmony which extends to harmony with people and harmony with nature."[36] Through facing the alienation of their own lives, peace educators are able to foster a sense of personal peace in themselves and in others. The harmony of personal peace grows out of a deep concern for social peace. This sense of peace is personal, local, and at once global. Personal peace, then, does not mean a blissful withdrawal from the world. It develops out of a recognition of the integrated nature of modern problems--problems which can be personal, local, and global. For example, when one's sense of personal peace is restricted to a search for spiritual enlightenment or personal salvation, there is no true harmony. But when one's action for peace is extended to the realm of social relations, there is harmony among the personal, local, and global dimensions. Harmony in this sense implies a recognition of the interconnectedness of human action. This sense of interconnectedness or relationship is the opposite of alienation. Thus alienation, like peace, can be personal, local, and global. Alienation is transcended when one accepts the responsibility for and the connections between one's actions and social reality. This point is emphasized by Toh Swee-Hin and Floresca-Cawagas when they write:

> Education for personal peace cannot be exclusively focused on the individual and neglect the social context. For many Philippinos issues of inner harmony may seem less important when social peace is still lacking, as for example under conditions of structural violence and militarization. Students who are taught to cultivate personal peace ought, at the same time, to develop a commitment to social responsibility based on values of justice, equity, human rights, and people power.[37]

The issues of Philippine peace education are similar to those raised by North American and British peace educators.

However, in most cases, this was not always so. Most people in the developed world have access to the basic necessities of life. This privilege has allowed many peace educators to focus their energies on the nuclear arms race. But in many Third World countries millions of children, women, and men suffer from malnutrition and disease. These problems, caused by a desperate lack of even the most basic needs, cause suffering and death on a daily basis. The issues of underdevelopment, poverty, militarism, human rights, and repression produced new and broadened approaches to peace education.

The Dimensions of Peace Education: From Canada

Terrance R. Carson teaches and researches at the University of Alberta, Department of Secondary Education, in the areas of social studies, teacher education, peace education, curriculum development, and action research. He has also been active in the development and organization of the annual International Institute for Peace Education held each summer at the University of Alberta. Wytze Brouwer teaches and researches at the University of Alberta, Department of Secondary Education. He is associated with the Peace Project at the Department of Secondary Education and is also a Fellow of the Canadian Institute of International Peace and Security.

Carson and Brouwer, in "an attempt to flesh out the meaning of peace education for Canadian schools,"[38] concur with the values that Hicks identified as underlying peace. These values which Carson and Brouwer term the "five dimensions of peace education" are useful, they write, in developing "a comprehensive conceptual framework for peace education."[39] They then caution peace educators that a conceptual framework must also guide practical action in classroom settings, action that has both a local and a global dimension.

Local educational activities, according to Carson and Brouwer, should at the same time help students to develop a global consciousness by "allowing students to see the links between what they do (and do not do) locally for peace and justice, and what is happening in the world."[40]

The links between "thinking globally and acting locally" are clearly illustrated, Carson and Brouwer argue, when Canadian students discover that "their attention to nuclear war is particularly a preoccupation of citizens of developed nations."[41]

Many citizens in the developing world face the violence of military repression on a daily basis. They also face "hunger, lack of clean water, and other examples of their economic marginality which leave them exposed both to natural disasters and to further exploitation."[42] Thus, by gaining a global perspective, "it is possible to see beyond the nuclear issue and to gain a better understanding of social justice and equity as dimensions of peace education."[43]

The dimensions and international perspectives of peace education are similar in many ways. These similarities are clearly shown in Table IV-1. The views of Betty Reardon (Teachers' College, Columbia University, New York) form perspective 1; David Hicks (St. Martin's College, Lancaster, England), perspective 2; Toh Swee-Hin and Virginia Floresca-Cawagas (World Council for Curriculum and Instruction, Philippine Chapter), perspective 3; and Terrance R. Carson and Wytze Brouwer (University of Alberta), perspective 4. The values and dimensions of peace education, as Table IV-2 indicates, form an integral part of a paradigm three approach to peace building. The values of social justice, environmental

TABLE IV-1 Perspectives on Peace Education

Values and Dimensions

1 **Reardon**	2 **Hicks**	3 **Toh and Floresca-Cawagas**	4 **Carson and Brouwer**
Integrity	Non-violence	Militarization	Non-violence
Humane Relationship	Economic Welfare	Structural Violence	Economic Welfare
Global Citizenship	Social Justice	Human Rights	Social Justice
Planetary Stewardship	Ecological Balance	Environmental Care	Ecological Balance
	Participation	Cultural Solidarity	Practical Action
		Personal Peace	

As Table IV-1 shows, in all of the above perspectives the concerns of peace education include much more than the mere absence of war. They include a global perspective which, as Table IV-2 indicates, is interrelated to the values of a Paradigm Three approach to peace building.

TABLE IV-2 Peace: Paradigm Three Core Values and Peace Education: Values and Dimensions

Peace

Social Justice	Environmental Care	Cultural Solidarity
	Peace Education	
Integrity	Integrity	Integrity
Humane Relationship	Humane Relationship	Humane Relationship
Non-violence	Non-violence	Non-violence
Planetary Stewardship	Planetary Stewardship	Planetary Stewardship
Global Citizenship	Global Citizenship	Global Citizenship
Economic Welfare	Ecological Balance	Personal Peace
Practical Action	Practical Action	Practical Action
Personal Peace	Personal Peace	
Militarization		

care, and cultural solidarity combined with the promotion of non-violence create the sense of global responsibility that underlies the third paradigm of peace building. Peace education, then, is concerned with more than peace understood as the absence of war. It should, as Wytze Brouwer writes,

> be concerned with recognizing and eliminating the conditions that lead to war. Thus the study of human rights, social justice, underdevelopment and poverty, and an examination of our responsibility for alleviating economic disparities and social injustices must become an important part of peace education.[44]

In this way international education, world studies, and global education are important components of education for peace.

Chapter IV Endnotes

[1] D. Hicks, "Education for Peace: Principles into Practice," Cambridge Journal of Education, 17, No. 1, 1987, p. 3.

[2] R. Lacey, C. Heffernan, and F. Hutchinson, Educating for Peace (Canberra, Australia: Canberra Publishing & Printing Co., 1987), p. 136.

[3] B. J. Wien, Peace and World Order Studies, 4th ed. (New York: World Policy Institute, N.d.), p. 2.

[4] M. Bryans, "Peace Education: Telling Jack and Jill the Facts of Life," Peace and Security, 1, No. 4., 1986-87, p. 6.

[5] B. A. Reardon, Comprehensive Peace Education (New York: Teachers' College Press, 1988), p. 19.

[6] I. M. Harris, Peace Education (Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland & Company Inc., 1988), p. 45.

[7] D. Selby, "World Studies: Towards a Global Perspective in the School Curriculum," Briefings, No. 37, 1984, p. 1.

[8] Harris, p. 47.

[9] R. C. Pradhan, "Education for Peace and Human Rights: Search for an Indian Perspective," Gandhi Marg 6, Nos. 4 and 5 (July-August, 1984), p. 273, cited in I. M. Harris, Peace Education, p. 47.

[10] Selby, p. 1.

[11] D. Hayes et al., Earth Day--The Beginning (New York: Arno Press, 1970), Foreword.

[12] Ibid.

[13] D. Heater, Peace Through Education (London: The Falmer Press, 1984), p. 23.

[14] Reardon, p. 31.

[15] Ibid.

[16] Ibid., p. 58.

[17] Ibid., p. 59.

[18] Ibid.

[19] Ibid.

[20] Ibid.

[21] Ibid.

[22] Hicks, p. 4.

[23] Ibid., p. 8.

[24] Ibid., p. 4.

[25] M. K. Gandhi, *Non Violent Resistance (Satyagraha)* (New York: Schocken Books, 1951), p. 6, cited in G. Cox, *The Ways of Peace* (New York: Paulist Press, 1986), p. 155.

[26] Cox, p. 155.

[27] S. H. Toh and V. Floresca-Cawagas, *Peace Education: A Framework for the Philippines* (Quezon City: Phoenix Publishing House, 1987), p. v.

[28] Ibid., pp. 5-10.

[29] Ibid., p. 12.

[30] Ibid., p. 17.

[31] Ibid., p. 18.

[32] Ibid., p. 21.

[33] Ibid., pp. 23-24.

[34] M. Pickering, "Environmental and Native Rights Groups Want World Bank Reform," *Alternatives: Perspectives on Society, Technology and Environment*, 14, No. 3, p. 75.

[35] Toh and Floresca-Cawagas, p. 27.

[36] Ibid., p. 28.

[37] Ibid.

[38] T. R. Carson and W. Brouwer, *Dimensions of Peace Education*, Curriculum Praxis (Edmonton: Publication Services, Department of Secondary Education, University of Alberta, Occasional Paper No. 39, 1985), p. 3.

[39] Ibid., p. 11.

[40] Ibid.

[41] Ibid., pp. 11-12.

[42] Ibid., p. 12.

[43] Ibid.

[44] W. Brouwer, "Peace Education," Alberta Science Education Journal, 22, No. 2, 1988, p. 18.

CHAPTER V: PEACE EDUCATION: THE CONTENT AND THE FORM

Introduction

The form of peace education is at least as important as the content. Contradictions arise when we use unpeaceful methods to deal with peace-oriented topics. These contradictions create conflictual reactions in students; peace education then becomes another disconnected abstraction on an overcrowded syllabus. In this chapter I will explore the relation between content and form in peace education.

Peace Education: The Content

The values and dimensions of peace and peace education are broad, controversial, political, and represent a clear call for action. Peace education is comprehensive, interdisciplinary, and action-oriented. There are, as Betty Reardon points out, "no clear and precise limits to nor standards for what is to be included in peace education."[1] Thus peace education is a cross-curricular concern although, as Reardon's research shows, "Secondary level [peace education] courses and units are taught as part of the social studies curriculum far more often than any other subject area." English or Language Arts is the next most popular subject area for peace educators. But the concerns of peace education can become part of the total curriculum. There are, Reardon writes, "virtually no subjects or grade levels for which peace education is not currently provided."[2]

In Dimensions of Peace Education, Terrance R. Carson and Wytze Brouwer make a similar point. Peace education, they write,

> cannot simply become another "discipline," another subject in the plethora of subjects to which our children are exposed in our schools. Rather, peace education must become the heart of the educational process; it must infuse the total curriculum from physics to social studies, from physical education to the fine arts.[3]

The broad base makes it difficult to "teach peace" as a separate subject area with its own place on the timetable. However, this situation does occur, as previously noted, in peace studies courses at colleges and universities.

A broad or positive definition of peace implies a broad view of peace education, one which is not content-centered. In the content-centered view, the peace educator would, for example,

> assume that information about weapons systems, the arms race and the effects of nuclear war will lead to an awareness of the issues and that this awareness will promote actions leading to a more peaceful world.[4]

The emphasis here is placed on instruction, information, and learning about the issues of peace education. The assumption is that if we knew more about the issues, we could help create a more peaceful world.

> In contrast to this a broader view of peace education has quite different implications for curriculum and teaching. While curriculum guides may be developed in certain peace related topics, this would not be restricted to a separate subject called peace education nor become a unit in a particular subject. Peace education in this view is a longer term process which aims at developing awareness and giving an orientation to action.[5]

This process, many peace educators claim, is best served by the infusion method. Peace educators using this method would infuse the school curriculum—whatever the grade or subject area—with elements of peace education. One does wonder, though, how much peace education—process or content-centered--has influenced public schooling.

In 1986, peace educator Wytze Brouwer conducted A Survey of Peace Education in Canadian Schools. As a result of this study, he drew the following conclusions:

> The survey showed that many of the components of peace education are reflected in Canadian school programs and are

> beginning to be integrated into history, geography, social studies, science, literature and drama courses. Teaching peace education, including nuclear awareness, appears to be consistent with all provincial ministry documents dealing with the goals of education.[6]

Brouwer's survey leaves one with the impression that peace education has made a significant impact on Canadian schools. However, in a 1988 survey, M. V. Naidu of Brandon University found that "there is considerable antipathy toward peace studies among Canadian academics and administrators."[7] One may still wonder, then, how much peace education has influenced day-to-day classroom practice. Using the infusion method--although it is difficult to measure--the issues of peace education can become reflected in school programs and affect attitudes and values that make up our world view. Isolated individual courses in peace education, though important in themselves, can create a fragmented approach to peace and the problems of peacelessness. These problems are central to the content of peace education programs. But when the focus shifts from content to form, peace education becomes education for peace.

Peace Education: The Form

"There is no way to peace, peace is the way" captures the meaning of the term "education for peace." Peace education, then, must become education for peace. The term "education for peace" represents a recognition that the way one teaches is as important as what one teaches. David Hicks puts it this way:

> If one is teaching for peace and not merely about peace, then a close relationship needs to exist between ends and means, content and form in peace education. If one is concerned about developing self-respect, appreciation of others, empathy, concepts of fairness and non-violence then they must also be a part of the process of learning. They must be an integral part of the teaching/learning relationship.[8]

Education for peace, then, implies a teaching/learning relationship that is based on peaceful pedagogical practices.

Peaceful pedagogical practices are best illustrated by contrasting them with "authority-centered learning." Authority-centered pedagogical practices, peace educators maintain, are fragmented and best suited to producing passive learners who, as a result of their learning process, are less likely to question the methods of their schooling or the world around them.[9] This process is similar to the Freirean concept of "banking education" in which the teacher (the one in authority) has all the knowledge and deposits bits of it in the students' memory banks. The students, in turn, withdraw from their memory banks the bits of information that they need to pass exams. This method of education, many peace educators maintain, relies on memory, suppresses critical thought, and creates passive students.[10] This does not mean that peace educators should, in the interest of reviving apathetic and passive students, terrorize them with the fear of impending nuclear destruction. Peace education programs should not be based on fear.

Peace education, as I have traced it, has evolved through particular phases. Each phase forms an important part of an education for positive peace. Betty Reardon charts the development in the following way. There was, she writes, "the reform phase, dating from the end of World War II, the reconstructive phase, developed in the 1960's, and the transformational phase, currently evolving."[11] Each phase is based on certain assumptions about war, its causes, and the educational response needed to help create a more peaceful world. These educational positions, Reardon points out, are characterized by certain pedagogical practices.

The focus of the reform response is on the prevention of war and control of the arms race. The immediate and long-term objectives of this response are behavioral. "The central thesis is that if people and nations behaved differently, gave more consideration to non-violent alternatives, war could be prevented."[12]

The reconstructive approach is concerned with the reconstruction of international institutions in an effort to abolish war and achieve total disarmament. The focus here is structural and institutional rather than behavioral. The structural emphasis is on the establishment of global institutions such as the United Nations to resolve conflict and keep the peace.[13]

The more inclusive transformational approach seeks to "make violence unacceptable, not only in interactions among individuals but also in interactions among nations, and to make violent consequences unacceptable in foreign policy planning."[14] The changes sought in the transformational approach to peace education are behavioral, institutional, and value-centered. Transformation, in this view, is understood as "a profound, global, cultural change that affects ways of thinking, world views, values, behaviors, relationships, and the structures that make up our public order."[15] This is no small task; as Reardon recognizes, it is a process in which peace education, even at its broadest, can only play a limited part. However peace education, as part of a transformational learning process that I have argued is part of a paradigm three approach to peace-building, can move us toward a more peaceful and humane world.

Each of these approaches to peace education are characterized by certain pedagogical practices. The reform and reconstructive approaches are characterized by the need to inform, instruct, and develop the critical skills that will facilitate participation in the process of reform. In the transformational approach, the pedagogical focus is different: "the emphasis is more on an educative mode, in the sense of 'drawing out' or eliciting learning."[16] It is this focus on the learning process that transforms peace education (learning about issues of peace and conflict) into education for peace (using peaceful pedagogical practices to draw out the capacity to learn). As David Hicks explains, "To teach for peace . . . means that the teaching/learning situation created must involve cooperation, participation, dialogue and self-reliance."[17] The pedagogical stance of education for peace is not intended to detract from the need of peace educators and students to develop an understanding of the problems of war and violence. Nor is the notion of transformation seen in an idealistic or utopian light. It is pragmatic and comprehensive. Betty Reardon comments on the practical approach to transformation. She writes,

> One practical step we can take to develop a field capable of meeting its challenge is to redefine negative peace so as to mean the total abolition of war as a human institution and positive peace as a social order in which the resort to armed conflict is no longer to be expected and certainly not accepted. Such a step would also move us toward a transformational approach to peace education and a more comprehensive definition of the field.[18]

Education for peace is a challenging field which deals with problems that threaten our very survival. It is imperative, as Toh Swee-Hin points out, "that careful and critical thought goes into the pedagogical principles which ought to underlie such education."[19]

Toh Swee-Hin argues in "Flowing Water Over Stones: Themes for Peaceful Pedagogies" that these pedagogical principles, if they are to avoid becoming fragmented and contradictory, must be based on solid foundational themes. In developing his themes, Toh Swee-Hin asked the following rhetorical questions:

> Is a teacher educating for peace . . . if students largely rote learn to regurgitate "facts" and "ideas" for a final examination on the manifold problems of conflict and violence in the world?

> Is peace education occurring when the sole outcome makes learners very "peaceful" and "joyful" within, quite oblivious to and unmoved by the suffering of countless human beings on planet earth?[20]

With these questions in mind, he lists the following five themes for peaceful pedagogies: Holism, Dialogue, Conscientization, Transpowerment, and Resistance.

Holism requires full recognition of the interconnectedness and multiple linkages between and among the different dimensions of conflict and violence. For example, the state of the environment has an internal relation to personal values and attitudes towards materialism and consumption. Holism also leads to the realization that structural violence--caused by unjust social systems--allows excessive consumption to exist side by side with the needless suffering of millions of children, women, and men. With these questions in mind, Holism asks the peace educator to examine the internal relations between personal and social peace. Holism asks "peace activists" who set out to dismantle structures of violence to consider the internal or external relations between their actions and a sense of peace based on brotherhood and love. Implicit in the theme of holism is the recognition that peace is not a state we reach but an activity in which we engage.

Peace educators must understand the internal relationship between "banking education" (where students are the passive repositories of "facts" and "values" deposited by teachers) and the socio-political illiteracy which allows and reinforces conditions of structural violence. With this realization comes the understanding that "education" is part of a dialogical encounter in which teachers and students become subjects in a transformational process. But the road to transformation is not clearly marked. Signs such as analysis, dialogue, critical awareness, intelligence, understanding, compassion, and love show the way. Education for peace then must be, Toh Swee-Hin writes,

> internally consistent in practice, so that its pedagogical processes are also peaceful. . . . Peaceful teachers engage their learners in a constant dialogue, in order that basic assumptions underlying any world view are critically analyzed and not passively accepted as given truths.[21]

This sense of dialogue implies trust and gives learners the opportunity to analyze, discuss, and take a position on issues of peace and conflict. The process leads to a critical understanding of the values and assumptions that underlie different positions on the issues under study. Toh Swee-Hin writes, "Peaceful pedagogies . . . have the long term responsibility of laying solid foundations of peace consciousness."[22] A cornerstone of this foundation is the Freirean concept of conscientization.

Conscientization requires dialogue but must also lead learners to critically explore and understand the political limits and possibilities of their life situations as experienced daily, personally, socially, and ultimately globally.[23] However, as Toh Swee-Hin and Floresca-Cawagas point out, conscientization does not guarantee political action. They write,

> Conscientization is meaningless if practice does not match words . . . . Education for peace hence constantly expects that ideals and promises are put into sincere practice, into the day-to-day business of living and interrelating among peoples and nations.[24]

The balance between critical reflection and critical action is as important in building more peaceful classrooms as it is in creating a more peaceful world.

At the base of peace education is the principle of empowerment. Ian Harris defines empowerment in this way:

> Peace education, by providing new information about non-violent alternatives, helps people to transform their lives from situations of powerlessness to situations where they actively work to overcome violence. Empowerment education liberates the intellect to allow individuals to question even the most basic assumptions about the meanings of life and social arrangements.

> It encourages students to construct their own meanings and prepares them to be effective citizens in democratic states . . . .[25]

Toh Swee-Hin, however, cautions the peace educator that conscientization and empowerment, while effective in countering the alienation and apathy that is a part of so many students' lives, are not enough. Empowerment, he explains, may occur without due consideration for the often unconscious but pervasive egoism or individualism that is characteristic of advanced industrial cultures. When, under these conditions, empowerment does take place, attachment to power can become an end in itself, seducing even the most well-intentioned. For example, the distorted consequences of empowerment can often be seen in the politics and practices of movements working for peace, "where individual activists and workers may espouse ideals of peacefulness" but act to the contrary. Their actions may be characterized by "dogmatism, factionalism, elitist 'expert' conduct, etc."[26] To overcome this danger, Toh Swee-Hin proposes transpowerment. He explains: "Transpowerment calls upon peace educators/learners therefore to constantly cultivate the virtue of humility, selflessness and an ongoing detachment from 'power' as a commodity."[27] Thus it is the task of education for peace to help learners empower themselves while at the same time to cultivate the spirit of transpowerment.[28]

The theme of resistance focuses on this question: What does it mean, as an educator in modern society, to be an educator for peace? Resistance, Toh Swee-Hin argues, is implied in the themes of dialogue and conscientization and it is expressed through critical analysis of social, economic, and political systems. The resisting intellectual would, whenever the opportunity arises, challenge and demystify the policies of accommodating intellectuals.[29] He defines "accommodating intellectuals" as "those who effectively serve the dominant interests within local, national, and global power-structures and contribute towards structural violence, militarization and human rights abuse."[30] Resisting intellectuals, on the other hand, challenge policies that contribute to violence, either direct or structural. For example, "resisting intellectuals" challenged and exposed:

> The World Bank/IMF complexes for reinforcing structural violence and environmental destruction, or challenged the cold war scientists who rationalize repressive interventions as well as provide intellectual services for Third World dictatorships . . . . It would be a failure of resistance if peace educators did not participate in social/political action outside their educational contexts. As earlier noted, conscientization per se does not lead automatically to political transformation.[31]

Thus resistance implies action and it implies a sense of personal, local, and global responsibility.

The form of education for peace is, in the work of peace educators Brouwer and Carson, defined by the aims of peace education. First, the aim of non-violence means that students should replace violent methods of dealing with conflict with non-violent methods. The instances of direct violence in most schools is rare. However, Brouwer and Carson remind us that:

> Schools need to look to internal structures of violence in their own operations. For example, school discipline practices which focus on imposed rules and regulations and punishments for breaking them, maintain a structure in which certain authorities have the power to impose their will by virtue of their status (as a teacher or as an administrator) while others must obey these because of their inferior status.[32]

For peace educators the task would be "to open such a system up to examination and evaluation, and ultimately to design new practices which would give students genuine input."[33] In this way, each member of the school community could exercise his/her right to determine the rules of the community and thus his/her responsibility to maintain them. Non-violence would then be practiced in the day-to-day operation of the school.

However, the authors caution,

> structures of violence are not usually noticed by those who do not experience their bad effects. It takes an effort of self-reflection for teachers and administrators to consider how daily school practice can do violence to children's rights to be heard and to make decisions.[34]

This process of analysis can be extended to the structures of violence which are experienced by the disadvantaged in the local and the global community.[35]

Within the school setting, justice and human rights--which are central principles of peace education--are expressed in efforts to reduce racial and sexist stereotyping and promote tolerance and understanding. Brouwer and Carson write,

> Justice demands that cultural differences be recognized and feminist perspectives be taken account of as alternate ways of seeing. Rather than prescribing practices then, justice as a guiding principle encourages a reflection on current taken for granted practices and encourages reform from within.[36]

In-school practice can be extended to issues in the local, national, and global community.

The principle of ecological balance can be applied to the classroom through the development of recycling programs and practices. Examples of excessive consumption could be exposed and examined in the classroom setting. This practice could have local, national, and global dimensions.

The principle of participation is a dimension of the practices just discussed. It means overcoming the problem of alienation and apathy through participation in an ongoing dialogue between the classroom and the world. For example, in World Studies 8-13: A Teacher's Handbook, Simon Fisher and David Hicks developed a unit on minorities which focuses on native American issues and touches many of the values and dimensions of peace education. In this unit, the student is given the opportunity "to explore the nature of the native American experience and to counter traditional stereotypes."[37] At the beginning of the unit, students are asked to list the words that come immediately to mind on hearing the words "Indian" or "native American." From these lists, a "composite list is made indicating how many times words such as 'tipi,' 'buffalo,' 'tomahawk,' 'savage,' 'scalping,' etc. come up."[38]

This list can then serve as the basis for discussion, with questions such as "Where do we get these words and images from?" "Do they accurately describe native people?" "What impression do they give?"[39] The fact that most writing about native people has been written from the perspective of the white man could be discussed. Then, in small groups, students are asked to read two passages: "Native American Voices" and "The Trail of Tears" (see Appendix 1). These stories give the student some understanding of the native perspective. Students are, after reading the stories, asked to think about how they would have felt and what they might have done if they had found themselves in the same situation. The group is asked to make a list of things they might do and to choose two ideas from the list to work with. Then, in turn, they are to report their thoughts and suggestions for action back to the class.

Working in groups, students imagine they are native people while they read "fact cards" that describe conditions in which many native people find themselves. Each fact is followed by a question. For example, "Why might this be the case?" or "What might be some reasons for this?"[40] Each group, after listing responses to the questions, reports what they could do to improve their situation.

The focus of this unit is on cultural solidarity and issues of stereotyping, prejudice, discrimination, and minority rights. But it is also concerned with social justice, "values and beliefs, unequal distribution of power, and interdependence between people and their environment."[41] The pedagogy is peaceful in the sense that it attempts to draw out the capacity to learn through discussion, analysis, reflection, and action rather than through systematic instruction. This dialogical approach leads to a critical understanding of the issues under study (conscientization) and can result in the empowerment of the learner.

In Appendix 2, I have included a more detailed example of a unit on human rights that sets out to deal with some of the issues and aims of peace education through role play, small group discussion, and other approaches which encourage participation and allow students to put themselves in the place of the people they are studying. The unit is also concerned with social justice, values and attitudes, the unequal distribution of wealth and power, and the interdependence between people and their environment. The pedagogy here is also consistent with peace in the sense that it is based on values of cooperation, participation, and dialogue. In this way, the balance between critical reflection and action can be developed and maintained.

The term "education for peace" then implies a concern for a re-appraisal of pedagogical practices to ensure that the values of cooperation, participation, dialogue, and positive peace are reflected in classroom activity and in the relationship between teacher and students who together become learners in the ongoing process of education for peace.

How do peace educators understand the process where both teachers and students become learners? Peaceful pedagogies, peace educators would argue, must embrace methods which are themselves peaceful. One characteristic of peaceful pedagogies is the change in the teacher/student relationship. This change from a traditional view where the teacher (the one in authority) has the knowledge and passes it on to the students becomes one where the teacher and students, in a climate of trust, learn together. This process calls on the teacher to discard the role where she or he is perceived as the holder of knowledge and authority and to take on the role of facilitator or animator who structures the learning situation for the development of reasoning powers. The students, based on their own insights and experiences and in dialogue with each other and the teacher, draw reasoned conclusions from the analysis of the issues under study.[42] Through dialogue, peace educators discover that:

> The learner brings to the learning community (educational milieu) visions and experiences that can potentially alter the curriculum content. The teacher who supports this development in his or her class and listens to his or her students is creating a condition for dialogue in which both parties co-manage exchanges. In these exchanges both parties are talking with each other, communicating with each other, confirming the other in person, not in role. The lines of roles (teacher, student) become dim and we see persons in dialogue about themselves and their world. [In this learning situation] the teacher is called upon to reveal himself or herself as a person, to get outside of the teacher role with its normative exchanges of calm authority residing in abundant knowledge. The student is invited likewise to reveal himself or herself without fear of ridicule from the others in the learning community.[43]

Thus learning comes to life. When this happens, the student becomes an active subject and participates in the educational-process, taking responsibility for her or his own learning. Learning situations, peace educators argue, if they involve aggressive competition, little or no participation on the part of the learner, lack of dialogue between the learner and the teacher and other forms of direct or structural violence "which make the learner dependent on or submissive to 'superiors' are inherently unpeaceful."[44]

The term "education for peace" is viewed therefore as basing its pedagogy on the values of cooperation, participation, dialogue, and positive peace. The types of learning activities that this approach to education for peace requires include, as David Hicks writes, "small group discussions, debates, role play, cooperative games, self and group evaluation and experiential games."[45] Carson and Brouwer make a similar pedagogical point. Education for peace, they argue, should incorporate "methods of learning which involve group discussions, debates, role playing, [and] student research projects . . . ."[46] Learning situations such as those described above lend themselves to a central concern for educating for peace. The focus of that concern is on "offering alternative viewpoints in an often violent world. . . ."[47] This focus, however, has not escaped critical comment. In the next chapter I will examine some of that comment.

Chapter V Endnotes

[1] B. A. Reardon, editor, Educating for Global Responsibility (New York: Teachers' College Press, 1988), p. xix.

[2] Ibid., p. xxi.

[3] T. R. Carson and W. Brouwer, Dimensions of Peace Education (Edmonton: Curriculum Praxis, Department of Secondary Education, Faculty of Education, University of Alberta, Occasional Paper No. 39, 1985), p. 3.

[4] Ibid., p. 14.

[5] Ibid.

[6] W. Brouwer, "Peace Education," Alberta Science Education Journal, 22, No. 2, 1988, p. 20.

[7] M. V. Naidu, "Meagre Support for Peace Studies," Peace, V, No. 3, June/July 1989, p. 27.

[8] D. Hicks, "Education for Peace: Principles Into Practice," Cambridge Journal of Education, 17, No. 1, p. 10.

[9] R. Burns, "Knowledge for Peace Education," The Bulletin of Peace Proposals, V, No. 2, 1981, pp. 115-118.

[10] Ibid.

[11] B. Reardon, Comprehensive Peace Education (New York: Teachers' College Press, 1988), p. xi.

[12] Ibid.

[13] Ibid.

[14] Ibid.

[15] Ibid., p. x.

[16] Ibid., p. xii.

[17] D. Hicks, Education for Peace: What Does It Mean? (Lancaster: Occasional Paper No. 1, Center for Peace Studies, 1982), p. 11.

[18] Reardon, Comprehensive Peace Education, p. 25.

[19] S. H. Toh, "Flowing Water Over Stones: Themes for Peaceful Pedagogies," Perspectives on Peace and Security, N. Kach et al., Eds. (Edmonton: Occasional Paper 88-1, Department of Educational Foundations, University of Alberta, 1988), p. 33.

[20] Ibid., p. 3.

[21] Ibid., p. 16.

[22] Ibid., p. 38.

[23] Ibid., p. 39.

[24] S. H. Toh and V. Floresca-Cawagas, Peace Education: A Framework for the Philippines (Quezon City: Phoenix Publishing House, 1987), p. 32.

[25] I. M. Harris, Peace Education (Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland and Company, 1988), p. 31.

[26] Toh, pp. 40-41.

[27] Ibid., p. 41.

[28] Ibid.

[29] Ibid., p. 43.

[30] Ibid., p. 42.

[31] Ibid., p. 43.

[32] Carson and Brouwer, p. 16.

[33] Ibid.

[34] Ibid., pp. 16-17.

[35] Ibid., p. 17.

[36] Ibid., p. 18.

[37] S. Fisher and D. Hicks, World Studies 8-13: A Teacher's Handbook (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1985), p. 119.

[38] Ibid.

[39] Ibid., p. 122.

[40] Ibid., p. 124.

[41] Ibid., p. 123.

[42] S. Wilson, "Breathing Life into the Curriculum," Toward a Renaissance of Humanity, T. R. Carson, Ed. (Edmonton: University of Alberta Printing Services, 1988), pp. 153-168.

[43] Ibid., p. 166.

[44] Hicks, Education for Peace: What Does It Mean?, p. 11.

[45] Hicks, Education for Peace: Principles into Practice, p. 10.

[46] Carson and Brouwer, pp. 27-28.

[47] Hicks, Education for Peace: Principles into Practice, p. 11.

CHAPTER VI: PEACE EDUCATION: SOME CRITICAL PERSPECTIVES

Introduction

The recent growth of peace education programs has drawn some critical attention. This chapter will focus on some of the critics of peace education. To make this view as broad as possible, I have drawn on the work of critics from a wide geographical base.

From Canada

Critics of peace education raise some serious issues. For example, the activities of an Ontario grade five class were brought to the attention of Nicholas Patterson, Executive Director of the Canadian Development Institute. The pupils, according to Patterson, participated in a letter-writing campaign to protest the Canadian government's defense spending. Patterson explains, "What is shocking is that these children were taught that Canada's defense spending is very high, when in fact it is so very low—indeed the lowest of all of NATO's 16 members."[1] Patterson continues that "true facts" of the issue were hidden from the grade five pupils. The "true facts" he is referring to are Canada's defense spending in relation to other NATO countries.

However, hiding the "true picture" is only part of the story. He goes on,

> [Once] this dimension was hidden from the children . . . [it was] replaced by misleading one-sided propaganda. Worse still, than the teaching of this intellectually dishonest picture, is the fact these children are being moulded as politically partisan agents of this false propaganda.[2]

The intent of the false propaganda, Patterson argues, is to encourage children to demand reductions in Canada's already low military preparedness.[3]

Patterson's argument is supported by defense spending statistics which relate defense spending to Gross National Product (GNP). According to Patterson's statistics, Canada spends "a mere 2.1% of its GNP on defense" while our American neighbors spend three times as much and the Soviets nearly seven times.[4] Given these statistics, one wonders what prompted the grade five students to write the letters. Did a well-meaning educator in her zeal to save the world from Armageddon overstep the bounds of good judgement and spread false propaganda? Were, as Patterson argues, the children being taught an "intellectually dishonest picture"? Worse than that, he writes, "these children are being moulded as politically partisan agents. . . . [Facts were] hidden from these children and replaced by misleading one-sided propaganda."[5] If Patterson's allegations are accurate—I say if because the reader is presented with Patterson's perspective only—then what took place in that grade five classroom was not an educational activity.

Perhaps a grade five teacher, concerned over the Canadian government's 1987 White Paper on defense announcing its intention to increase military spending by an estimated $185 billion over the next twenty years, provided her motivation; or perhaps it was the specific allotment of $8 billion for nuclear-powered, hunter, killer submarines.[6] Those questions must remain unanswered, because the reader is not made aware of the teacher's perspective.

Many Canadian citizens opposed the projected increase in military spending and the possibility of a nuclear posture for the Canadian Forces. Patterson does not include this information in his discussion of military spending. It is worth noting that these "peace through strength" military expenditures were eventually shelved.

There could, however, be an element of truth in Patterson's allegations. Zealous teachers have been known to take extreme positions and encourage students to do the same. One need only recall the James Keegstra case to bear this out. In any case, misleading and one-sided propaganda disguised as peace education is a concern for all educators.

Peace education, Wytze Brouwer writes,

> must have a knowledge component that provides students with facts on which decisions can be based; a values component that disposes them to search for non-violent solutions to personal, social and international conflicts and a skill component that equips them to solve conflicts, to think critically, and to take responsibility for the pursuit of peace in all areas of life.[7]

The components of peace education, as Brouwer describes them, are not related to what Patterson argues took place in the grade five classroom. If the teacher of that grade five class "taught," as Patterson argues, "an intellectually dishonest picture," then the inherent violence of such an enterprise would not be considered peace education.

One must keep in mind, however, that "A peace educator can no more be neutral between peace and war than a healer can between health and sickness."[8] One must also ask, How many educators are familiar with the components of peace education? Does a teacher's university training prepare her or him to respond to student concerns about nuclear issues, environmental problems, racism, prejudice, and other forms of direct and structural violence? Assuming that, for the most part, teacher preparation does not include enquiry into the roots of these problems, how should teachers respond when students raise these issues in the classroom? A great number of students are deeply concerned about the problems.

Many studies, both national and international, have indicated the extent to which nuclear and other issues impact on the lives of today's students.

> The research evidence strongly suggests too that it is often silence on such issues, which are part of today's reality rather than their actual discussion in the classroom that reinforces feelings of powerlessness.[9]

For example, when my son Jody was thirteen and the hungry, fly-covered faces of Africa appeared on our television screen, he sent $20 of his savings to Oxfam. A unit on ecology had Jody and his grade eight classmates studying Edmonton's river valley. The students' reports of the river valley study were punctuated with sketches of pollution and environmental destruction. One evening, after I noticed "No Cruise" written all over Jody's new sneakers, I asked him, "Jody, of all the problems you might have to face in your life, what frightens you the most?"

Without hesitation he answered, "Nuclear war."

"Do you discuss it in class?"

"No," he replied.

Studies have shown that many children and adolescents, whether they are from the Soviet Union or Canada, are "experiencing deep anxiety over the possibility of nuclear war."[10] This anxiety, for many students, creates a sense of apathy and despair that reaches beyond the nuclear issue and affects how they respond to other social, political, economic, and ecological problems.[11] Apathy, despair, fatalism, or resignation do not help students to develop into participating citizens.

Activities such as letter writing, petitions, and classroom discussions help counter feelings of isolation and powerlessness. But when these activities raise questions about societal values, they become open to criticism. When questions are raised by students in letters to government representatives, then the controversy over how much education should call dominant social values into question becomes more intense. These critical and sometimes uninformed activities often represent sincere responses by students to the problems of the day. However, the activities are often lumped by critics into a large, grey area that is conveniently termed "peace education." I wonder what label was placed on student activities such as letter writing before the term "peace education" came into use?

In order to better appreciate the comments of peace education critics, it will be helpful to review four particular views of education which David Hicks has described in the following way:

> —the "liberal humanitarian" tradition which is primarily concerned with passing on the basic cultural heritage from one generation to another;
> --the child-centered tradition which values self-development, self-reliance and social harmony for the individual student;
> --the utilitarian tradition which sees the main job of education as equipping students to go well prepared into an already defined situation;
> --the reconstructionist tradition which sees education as a potential instrument for changing society.[12]

Education for peace, according to Hicks, is child-centered and reconstructionist. These two historical traditions, he writes, are true to the goals of peace and justice and appropriate to the turmoil of the twentieth century. This turmoil results in and from the rapid rate of social, political, and economic change. It demands of students that they be self-reliant, flexible, and adaptable.[13]

To these historical traditions, Betty Reardon adds the need for transformational approaches to learning. She explains the transformational approach in this way:

> Many forms of peace education seek to be in practice and consequence, vehicles for global transformation, which implies change of the widest possible depth in personal perspectives and behaviors. . . .[14]

Thus the transformational approach to learning questions dominant attitudes and values, questions the methods of the school, and seeks to transform the teaching/learning relationship into one where both teacher and students become learners together. Education for peace, then, should be part of a process that helps students develop a critical perspective and which fosters the ability to understand and criticize other points of view. To facilitate this process, educators must present students with multiple points of view as fairly as possible and not work to create "reliable troops in a peace army."[15]

It is the aims, methods, and contents of peace education that draw the critical attention of Roger Scruton. For example, in his pamphlet Education or Indoctrination, Scruton argues that some of the processes of education for peace which utilize drama, role play, and simulation are manipulative. Scruton describes how the manipulation takes place. He writes,

> The child is encouraged to cease thinking analytically, and to experience anger, hostility, fear, a sense of injustice, and the joys of cooperative endeavor. By playing on a child's emotions in this way, his behavior can be influenced in advance of his understanding. . . . This manipulation of feelings is summed up in such phrases as "action knowledge" and "attitudinal education."[16]

Scruton is making specific reference to simulation games that are designed to increase awareness of Third World inequality (i.e. the unequal distribution of resources). These games often involve the distribution of cookies or some other treat to students according to the country they represent. For example, student X representing the United States would receive ten cookies; student Y, representing the Soviet Union, 5 cookies; while student Z representing Ethiopia would receive a small piece. The students then eat their allotment of cookies, usually without sharing. The assumption is that students, in this way, become aware of the unequal distribution of the world's resources and of the grinding poverty that afflicts many people in the Third World.

It is at this point that the cookies hit the fan, for it is very often the case, Scruton claims, that the problems of unequal distribution of the world's resources is blamed on an unjust economic system, which he points out may or may not be true. The problem for Scruton is that this process is incomplete without "arduous study and analysis."[17] He writes, "It is at this point that the impulse towards indoctrination is born, involving the protection of favored conclusions from refutation or serious analysis."[18] Peace educators, of course, would not agree with Scruton's analysis and would point out that in most cases,

> while the teachers hold views on peace issues which generally diverge from neo-conservative beliefs, students are exposed to a variety of theoretical, including neo-conservative positions.[19]

The focus on a critical perspective requires that the many sides of controversial issues be presented to students.

The critical focus is at the core of peace education. It would, many educators argue, be inherently violent to manipulate students into accepting positions which have not been subjected to rigorous analysis. In fact, most peace educators recognize the problems that one can encounter--such as charges of "bias and indoctrination"--when dealing with controversial issues and clearly present other perspectives on the issues under study.

From Great Britain

Bias and indoctrination, according to Roger Scruton, run rampant in peace education, development education, and the world studies program. World Studies and Development Education, he argues, are barely distinguishable from Peace Studies courses (Scruton does not make a distinction between Peace Studies and Peace Education). World Studies, Development Education, and Peace Studies are, he writes, "promoted by and large, by the same group of teachers and educationalists."[20] Among the problems that Peace Studies presents for Scruton is what he claims takes place when students learn about the sufferings of others. He explains it this way: "When people learn about the sufferings of their fellow men they are stirred to sympathy, and the person who can awaken and guide our feelings towards the poor has a powerful weapon at his disposal."[21] When this weapon is turned on students who in the process are introduced to the concept of oppression, they can then be incited to political action on behalf of the oppressed. Scruton continues,

> If this process can be disguised as "education," provided with a curriculum and resources, and approved by the appropriate officials, then it may be freely and openly conducted at the expense of the State, before a captive audience and without fear of redress. Indoctrination—usually called by some other name, such as "attitudinal education"—can be spread throughout our schools.[22]

Scruton paints a bleak picutre, one that would give any educator cause for alarm. But do his allegations have any basis in fact? He does not provide a clear answer to this question.

However, Scruton has sounded the alarm before. In Peace Studies: A Critical Survey (1984), Caroline Cox and Roger Scruton argued that Peace Studies represent an indoctrination into appeasement and that the intention of its proponents are politically suspect.[23] But Scruton's comments were based more on contingencies about what could be the case rather than on hard data about what is or was the case.[24] His views on peace education are echoed by other conservative thinkers such as Pat Jacobs.

From Australia

Pat Jacobs looks at peace education and peace studies from an Australian perspective. In Operation Peace Studies, he raises some serious questions regarding the content of peace studies courses. However, it is not only the content of peace studies courses that concerns Jacobs. He questions the political or ideological sympathies of peace educators. Jacobs does not make a distinction between peace studies and peace education. According to him:

> The term peace studies incorporates a profusion of pseudo subjects including: disarmament, third world issues, Soviet-American relations, the uranium issue, radical feminist issues, the re-examination of subject methodologies, human rights, militarism, structural violence, world resource sharing, personal problem solving, analysis of the economic basis of conflict, promotion of non-violence and pacifism. The core organising concept of peace studies, however, is the allegedly evil and militaristic nature of Western societies.[25]

Jacobs accurately describes many of the issues of peace studies; however, peace educators would argue that the core organizing concept of peace studies is not the "evil and militaristic nature of Western society." Rather they might point out that the core organizing concept of peace studies is the need for a global perspective on these issues, a perspective which is internally related to the core values of social justice, environmental care, and cultural solidarity. Jacobs, however, would not agree.

In fact, he further argues that in peace studies courses "peace is defined in terms of Soviet demands and Soviet definitions." These are serious allegations but Jacobs does not stop there. He continues, "Peace studies proponents are hostile to free societies. They are hostile to the foreign policies of Australia and the United States, to NATO, ANZUS, and the Western system of alliances."[26] Jacobs uses a broad brush when he paints peace studies proponents as "hostile to free societies." What prompted him to make such a serious allegation? Does the explanation lie in the recent events surrounding the ANZUS pact? Let me expand on this point. In 1951 Australia, New Zealand, and the United States became treaty partners in the ANZUS pact. The ANZUS alliance is a broad agreement guaranteeing that members of the alliance will consult together in the event of threat in the Pacific region to any of the three partners. The New Zealand government has argued that ANZUS is not a nuclear alliance and in 1986 Prime Minister Davide Lange made the following statement:

> Many Americans may ask why New Zealand is legislating to exclude nuclear weapons from our islands. We see this move as the most practical measure we can take to lessen the risk of nuclear conflict in our part of the world.[27]

Some teachers may be naive or not well informed about super-power defense policies, but to claim that "peace studies proponents are hostile to free societies"[28] is stretching the limits of credibility. The essence of Jacob's criticism echoes in the work of William Maley. Maley adds to the anti-communist hysteria when he implies that peace studies proponents are pro-Soviet.

According to Maley, members of the communist party tend to play an active part in the peace movement. He argues that:

> Given the overlap in personnel between the peace movement and peace educators, it would be surprising if there were not quite a number of teachers who would be extremely "coy" about many of the international activities of the USSR.[29]

Is Maley implying that many peace educators are communists? He does seem to be questioning the intent of peace educators when he writes, "Peace studies courses place surprisingly little emphasis on the international activities of the Soviet Union."[30]

One must ask if peace educators are "coy" about the international activities of the Soviet Union. Do they place "surprisingly little emphasis" on the Soviet Union's international activities and if they do, why do they do it? This is partly because, according to Maley, peace researchers and educators lack the linguistic skills and historical technique necessary to function in a competent and scholarly manner. However, he continues, "the personal inclinations of the teacher may also account in part for this lack of emphasis."[31] The teacher's personal inclinations may account for the lack of emphasis, if indeed there is a lack; but then again they may not. Maley, however, seems to be convinced that peace studies courses and peace education in general are responsible for presenting an imbalanced view of the Soviet Union's international activities. He writes, "The problem of coping with imbalance cf this kind is a difficult one. . . . Teachers after all are humans with human weaknesses."[32]

What does Maley mean? Does he mean that all teachers could present an unbalanced view of any issue because they are human? Do all teachers bring their particular assumptions, values, and perceptions to the classroom? Are some teachers value-free and others not, or could it be as Peter Dale Scott pointed out, that "A peace educator can no more be neutral between peace and war than a healer can between health and sickness."[33] Maley never clarifies these points but he does remind us of the complexity of peace studies. He writes, "To put it bluntly, peace studies, if they are to be carried out at the appropriate level of sophistication, are beyond the capacity of most school teachers and virtually all school pupils."[34] In other words, Maley implies that educators and students should leave the issues of peace education to the experts. This view is clearly associated with a top down view of peace, one which takes the responsibility for peace building out of the hands of the majority of people and places it in the hands of the experts.

Educational psychologist John Mitchell does not agree with Maley. Mitchell writes about one of the issues of peace education, nuclear war:

> The citizens of North America and our brothers and sisters in the Soviet Union have entrusted our lives, our future and our children to half a dozen men in Washington and Moscow, or even worse, somehow, [to] men buried in granite silos in the Ural and Rocky Mountains.[35]

Robert Spencer, in "A Superintendent Gives His Reasons for Teaching About Nuclear Issues," writes:

> My own sense as an educator tells me that if a subject is avoided, if it is too controversial, that is all the more reason why it should be included in the experiences of learners. As educators we have a responsibility to deal with controversy, for it is out of conflict and disequilibrium that real learning takes place. We cannot allow others to take away our right to think critically about vital materials.[36]

Former American ambassador to Moscow George Kennan, when asked what the average citizen could do to lessen the danger of nuclear war, gave the following advice. He said they should:

> study, learn how to argue, learn why they [the experts, the perceived enemy] believe what they believe, not just emotionally but intellectually, and then try to increase their influence as citizens in public affairs. . . . I do believe that the public discussion of the problems presented by nuclear weaponry now taking place in this country is going to go down in history as the most significant any democratic society has ever engaged in. . . .[37]

It is precisely the public discussion to which Kennan refers that I have identified as a component of a paradigm three approach to peace.

The evolution and significance of this "public discussion" is traced in Chapters I and II and does not need to be recounted here. But there is a need for peace educators to respond to the claims of the critics. Toh Swee-Hin puts it this way: "There is a need for peace educators to more systematically and explicitly include neo-conservative cr 'peace through strength' literature and information in their curriculum resources."[38] The critical edge of education for peace is fueled by the presentation of multiple perspectives on the issues under study. Toh Swee-Hin advises peace educators to "more systematically and explicitly" include peace through strength views in their resources because the presentation of multiple perspectives should go hand-in-hand with education for peace. Part of an education for peace, then, is the presentation of multiple perspectives on single issues. These perspectives are "critically assessed and independently accepted or rejected in part or in whole by the learners themselves."[39] The process is effective in countering charges of bias and indoctrination.

There is, however, more to the critics' allegations than communist hysteria or political indoctrination. They claim that the educational enterprise represents a move toward relevance and a lack of conceptual clarity. Peace studies courses and peace education programs, critics claim, are lacking in rigor and dilute the traditional curriculum. Maley, for example, argues that the issues of peace studies are too complex for students or teachers to deal with in peace education classes. "The responsible teacher," Maley points out, "must resist the temptation to satisfy the students' curiosity with a simplistic and superficial answer."[40] The issues of peace studies and peace education are among the most serious problems that humanity has faced. Dealing with these issues is a rigorous and intellectually demanding task that does not lend itself to simplistic and superficial answers. But Maley is not convinced and argues that, "The fundamental problem with most peace studies courses is not that they are doctrinaire, as Pat Jacobs has sought to demonstrate in a recent book, but that they are theoretically amateurish."[41] This statement underscores the claim by Maley and others that peace studies and peace education lack conceptual rigor.

The claim that peace education lacks conceptual rigor is often seen to be part of a wider problem of falling educational standards. This perceived problem is usually met with calls for a "return to the basics." The focus on peace studies and peace education is also seen to mark a further lowering of educational standards by introducing relevancy into the school curriculum. Opponents of peace education have argued that peace studies do not have a place in the school curriculum and should not receive public funding.[42]

The intellectual rigor of peace studies, critics argue, is compromised by the interdisciplinary character of the enterprise. Proponents of peace education might point out that the growing trend toward specialization in Western societies has been accomplished by a fragmentation of awareness that is manifested in the inability to deal with the complexities of today's problems. The complexities of our social and environmental problems often transcend the familiar boundaries of established disciplines and demand an interdisciplinary approach that is not lacking in rigor. Peace education, then, is an area of study based on the perspectives and approaches of several academic disciplines. The academic enterprise of peace research requires "some knowledge of ecology, psychology, sociology/anthropology/politicology/economics and international relations. . . ."[43] To this must be added some insight into the forces of history. The findings of the peace researcher must be digested by the peace educator and used to inform peace education programs. This activity can be a rigorous, intellectual adventure for both teachers and students.

The rigor of the adventure, peace educators argue, is not lessened by the relevancy of the topic. In fact, they point out, "if young people are genuinely interested in what they are learning and see it as relevant to their particular needs then they are likely to be better motivated to read and write well."[44] Thus, many educators maintain, peace education and the basics are complementary rather than contradictory activities.[45] The basics, some peace educators argue, should be redefined "to include skills in political or social literacy for socially responsible participation within a democratic society."[46]

Chapter VI Endnotes

[1] N. J. Patterson, "Peace Education: The Case Against," Pugwash Papers, Spring 1988, p. 10.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Ibid.

[6] B. Penner, "Is Canada Becoming Militarized?" Perspectives on Peace and Security, Occasional Paper 88-1, Department of Educational Foundations, University of Alberta, 1988, p. 17.

[7] W. Brouwer, "Peace Education," Alberta Science Education Journal, 22, No. 2, 1988, p. 18.

[8] P. D. Scott, "Towards a Transpolitics: The Role of the Peace Educator," Peace Education and the Task for Peace Educators, T. R. Carson and H. D. Gideonse, Eds. (N.p.: World Council for Curriculum and Instruction, 1987), p. 95.

[9] R. Lacy, C. Heffernan, and F. Hutchinson, Educating for Peace (Canberra, Australia: Canberra Publishing & Printing Co., 1987), pp. 141-142.

[10] C. Turner, "The Impact upon Children and Adolescents of Living with the Possibility of Nuclear Annihilation: An Overview of Current Research," Alberta Psychology, 13, Nos. 5 and 6, 1984, p. 30.

[11] J. R. Macy, "Despair and Personal Power in the Nuclear Age," Alberta Psychology, 13, Nos.5 and 6, 1984, pp. 8 and 10.

[12] D. Hicks, "Education for Peace: Principles into Practice," Cambridge Journal of Education, p. 6.

[13] Ibid.

[14] B. Reardon, Comprehensive Peace Education (New York: Teachers' College Press, 1988), p. 47.

[15] P. D. Scott, p. 94.

[16] R. Scruton, Education or Indoctrination? (London: Alliance Publishers, 1985), pp. 34-35.

[17] Ibid., p. 13.

[18] Ibid.

[19] S. H. Toh, "Neo-Conservatives and Controversies in Australian Peace Education: Some Critical Reflections and a Counter Strategy," in A Just Peace Through Transformation, Eds. C. Alger and M. Stohl (Boulder: Westview Press, 1988), p. 12.

[20] Scruton, p. 7.

[21] Ibid.

[22] Ibid.

[23] D. Aspin, "Peace Studies and Education: A Rejoinder to Scruton," Cambridge Journal of Education, 17, No. 1, 1987, p. 12.

[24] Ibid.

[25] P. Jacobs, Operation Peace Studies (Melbourne: Rosa Research & Publications, 1985), p. 1.

[26] Ibid., p. 2.

[27] D. Lange, "Why New Zealand Wants to be Nuclear-Free," Toronto Star, Jan. 10, 1986, p. A13.

[28] Jacobs, p. 12.

[29] W. Maley, Peace Studies: A Conceptual and Practical Critique, Peace Research Center, Working Papers, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University, Canberra, 1986, p. 19.

[30] Ibid.

[31] Ibid.

[32] Ibid.

[33] Scott, p. 95.

[34] Maley, p. 22.

[35] J. Mitchell, "Have We Resigned Ourselves to Nuclear Annihilation?" Alberta Psychology, 13, Nos. 5 and 6, 1984, p. 2.

[36] R. Spencer, "A Superintendent Gives His Reasons for Teaching About Nuclear Issues," Alberta Psychology, 13, Nos. 5 and 6, 1984, p. 5.

[37] G. Kennan, "Avoiding the 'Probable' War," Alberta Psychology, 13, Nos. 5 and 6, 1984, p. 19.

[38] Toh, p. 218.

[39] Ibid., p. 219.

[40] Maley, p. 12.

[41] Ibid., p. 2.

[42] This point is argued by Jacobs, Maley, and Scruton.

[43] J. Galtung, "Twenty-Five Years of Peace Research: Ten Challenges and Some Responses," Journal of Peace Research, 22, No. 2, 1985, p. 148.

[44] Lacey, Heffernan, and Hutchinson, p. 146.

[45] Ibid.

[46] Ibid.

CHAPTER VII: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

In this chapter I will review the evolution in peace thinking that is responsible for the emergence of education for peace as it is understood today. This understanding is informed by the values of social justice, environmental care, and cultural solidarity and is reinforced through peaceful pedagogical practices. The discussion will then be summarized and related to the question, "What is the intended outcome of education for peace?"

The theme of participation is central to peace education. It marks a recognition that peace is realized through its pursuit. Lasting peace cannot be imposed; it grows and develops out of the efforts of ordinary people. In this thesis, I have attempted to explore the participatory theme in the context of three major paradigms of peace making. This has involved an enquiry into the meaning of peace and peace education.

The evolution of peace thinking, as traced here, began with the Quaker experience of peace which is one of an inner peace that works from the inside out (paradigm one). Then, beginning with Immanuel Kant's essay on "Perpetual Peace," the enquiry focused on a view of peace which is achieved by the leaders or elite of society and given to or imposed on the common people. Peace, in this view, is intended to work from the top down (paradigm two). The third paradigm of peace making, which emerged in the late 1950's and early 1960's, works from the bottom up: it springs from the efforts of ordinary people, from the grass roots. It has had success and it is evolving. Peace making, in this view, is not a negation of the previous two paradigms but an extension. The ability to participate in this transformation in peace thinking is a dimension of education for peace.

Education for peace is an instrument for change. It works from the bottom up, from the top down, and from the inside out. The aim of education for peace is to allow students, through the process of conscientization and empowerment, to realize that their situation or situations in society at large are part of a social order that can be called into question and can be changed through the efforts of ordinary people. But this is a complex and controversial matter. The act of calling the social order into question arouses the critics of peace education. The well-known quotation "When I feed the poor, they call me a saint; when I ask why the poor have no food, they call me a communist"[1] aptly describes the dilemma that confronts peace educators.

However, some criticism of peace education does provide important and constructive comments that correctly identify weaknesses in peace education programs. For example, it is not clear how much a teacher's university training prepares her or him to deal with the complexities of contemporary social issues. But as psychologists, educators, and many other people have argued, not to respond to student concerns surrounding problems such as nuclear issues, environmental problems, and other controversial issues of peacelessness is to reinforce a sense of apathy and powerlessness in students. Robert Sperber writes,

> Educators have a responsibility to serve as adult role models for their students. As educators we have a responsibility to teach students content about nuclear issues to help them make intelligent choices, to help them think about a critical issue and to give them a useful outlet for their thoughts and their feelings.[2]

The responsibilities that Sperber refers to are included in the dimensions of peace education.

These dimensions do not include ill-considered, unsupported, sensationalist arguments or actions in support of a particular point of view. They do, however, include a fundamental respect for human dignity and support for universal human rights (cultural solidarity). Peace educators hope to facilitate the development of attitudes and capacities that will, through the value of cultural solidarity, foster in their students a recognition of their responsibility as caring members of the global community. Through the value of environmental care, this sense of caring is extended to all living things. Underlying the value of social justice is the hope that students will take responsibility for and live in a state of peace as the normal condition of human affairs. These values illustrate the interconnectedness of human action and increase students' awareness of their global responsibility.

In an ideal world, this approach to peace education combined with the transformation in the teaching/learning situation discussed in Chapter V—where teacher and students become learners together—would help students develop into self-aware, participating citizens who, based on the realization of personal peace, could transcend the violence of modern society. This would entail restructuring the hierarchical, top down, authority-centered education system into one more in keeping with the transformation of the teacher/student relationship.

However, the world is far from ideal and teachers as well as students are characterized by imperfections. Administrative pressures and time constraints can limit an educator's ability to explore the world of peace education. Peace educators, then, should be clear about what they hope to accomplish. Historically, peace education and peace movements have not been very successful at saving the world from the horrors of war. One might ask then, What is the intended outcome of peace education programs, and what purpose do they serve?

Most peace educators realize that their students will not, after completing their studies, become part of a peace force that will finally bring peace to the world. However, the critical edge of peace education should help students analyze and discuss their existing values and discover new ones. The intended outcome of peace education programs should be, and for the most part is, to foster in students the ability to critically analyze the issues under study, to facilitate the acquisition of decision-making skills, and to help students--through the process of empowerment and cooperative action—become active participants in democratic states.

Peace education is part of a long-term process that acknowledges the value of arms control agreements and international treaties as an important part of the struggle for peace. But the critical and participatory dimension of peace education is in essence a recognition that the future of peace lies in the hands of ordinary women and men, in their values and attitudes, and in their understanding of the interrelated problems of peacelessness. It is through this understanding that the values and dimensions of peace education represent an affirmation of life and a realization that "There is no way to peace, peace is the way."

The Dialogue Continues....

John has read the thesis Peace Education: How Did We Get It and What Does It Mean? and now has a list of questions prepared to discuss with Professor Simpson in his office:

Professor Simpson:

Well, John, what did you think of the thesis?

John:

It reads well and covers a lot of ground, but there are issues that remain unclear to me. I do, however, have some definite questions to ask.

Professor Simpson:

Good. What is your first question?

John:

The concluding sentence—"There is no way to peace, peace is the way." What does that mean?

Professor Simpson:

It means that we cannot work for peace with violent means.

John:

Yes, I understand that, but peace and violence are defined so broadly that I am, in some cases, unable to make a clear distinction between the two. Direct violence is clear enough, but the concept of structural violence is not at all clear.

Professor Simpson:

The concept is not as radical as you might think. Even as far back as the 1920's, John Dewey recognized that economic inequality and social injustice are major causes of domestic and international violence.[3] He argued that without social and economic justice, world peace is impossible.

John:

How would you define social and economic justice?

Professor Simpson:

Social and economic justice would be present in a humane social order, in a social order characterized by egalitarian social structures rather than by violence and oppression. People in this just society, rather than exploiting each other, would cooperate in solidarity. The values of a just social order would be equity, autonomy, and solidarity as opposed to inequality, oppression, and alienation.

John:

All right. Can we go back to that final sentence again? If there is no way to peace, then how do we get there?

Professor Simpson:

Action for peace will point the way. Peace is a condition that has never actually existed; because of this, it is hard to present in descriptive form other than through utopian models and hypothetical proposals. However, as I understand it, to work for peace is to eliminate the basis for violence, both direct (committed for personal reasons by one against another) and structural (the accepted and customary modes of social organization that make violence inevitable).

John:

I see the difficulty of specifying any particular "shape" of a social order that is fundamentally peaceful. But I find the broad definition of violence difficult to understand. According to the way violence is defined in the thesis, everything is violent except for peace—and it never clearly says what peace is essentially, regardless of the form it takes in particular circumstances.

/

Professor Simpson:

Direct violence—committed by one person or group against another—is clear enough. Structural violence is more subtle and, as a result, not as obvious. It involves a combination of exploitation and fragmentation. The effects of both levels of violence are destructive and divisive. It perpetuates the instrumental view of the world that is responsible for the global crisis that threatens all forms of life.

John:

Now the introduction to the thesis is clear. The World Commission on Environment and Development's "global agenda for change" is about the elimination of violence—violence to ourselves, to each other, and to the earth. This violence, the Commission claims, stems from our world view and is reflected in our attitudes and values. And presumably as this basis for violence is removed, peace is already there, taking its own somewhat unpredictable form.

Professor Simpson:

Yes John, global economic inequities condemn the majority of humans to poverty and oppression.

John:

Then liberation theologians work for peace in the sense that they work—in solidarity with the poor--to expose and examine the roots of poverty and oppression?

Professor Simpson:

Yes, but once the roots are exposed and examined, the struggle for peace includes non-violent action to transcend the oppression. This has been expressed as empowerment by conscientization.

John:

Some liberation theologians, after witnessing so much unnecessary suffering and death, have become part of a violent struggle to liberate the people.

Professor Simpson:

That is their personal decision, John, and each person may or may not be supported with genuinely good reasons with reference to special circumstances. That is, their decision may or may not be adequately justified; but the intelligent ideal in securing lasting peace is to work against violence in all its forms—which implies that non-violent means must be searched for and actualized wherever possible.

John:

That points to a difficult problem: What do we do when values conflict? How can we resolve our difficulties? How, for example, can the poor majority in Latin America work for peace through non-violent action when they face a military junta that is responsible for the torture, rape, and death of innocent people? Will non-violent action melt the hearts of the junta?

Professor Simpson:

That is most unlikely, of course, and we cannot afford to be naive. But I believe I am on firm ground when I say that violent action is not peaceful action and that peace is the way. Violent movements are not peace movements and they may only serve to stop a particular moment of oppression. The means to a peaceful resolution of conflict must be peaceful in themselves. The oppressed, through violence, become oppressors; then the ongoing cycle of violence perpetuates itself.

John:

Yes, I see that. So if violence is division, fragmentation, and alienation, it is any action that fractures human unity and prevents the realization of human potential in a context of harmony.

Professor Simpson:

Yes, and it manifests itself in our relationship with each other and with the environment locally, nationally, and globally. But a conceptual awareness of the interconnectedness of all things is not enough. Awareness must be manifested in consistent action. This action was termed "conflict with the world" in an earlier chapter. The conflict is not violent. It is the conflict that arises when we realize our very existence is threatened by our everyday behavior. At that point, it is time to reconsider our attitudes and values and determine how our personal actions contribute to a condition of personal, local, and global peacelessness. The action which stems from conscientization, critical reflection, and a realization of the interconnections of human action can be transformational, revolutionary, and peaceful.

John:

A peaceful revolution...?

Professor Simpson:

Yes, John, the revolution is a revolution in thinking and--as argued in the thesis--it is already underway. The revolution is part of a Paradigm Three approach to peace and peace education.

John:

Now I understand why some peace educators say that peace education should not be treated as a separate topic but should "infuse" the entire curriculum.

Professor Simpson:

Yes, John, the path is not clearly marked; it has never--consistently and on a large scale--been travelled before. This transformation in peace thinking--from a predominantly "peace through strength" perspective to a view of peace as an unfolding possibility which grows out of its pursuit--is revolutionary.

John:

Then viewing peace as the forceful control of violent conflict is wrong.

Professor Simpson:

That is the core of the thesis. The pursuit of peace solely or primarily through the control of violence is flawed. The pursuit of peace is a permanent state. This pursuit should include the concepts of balance of power, collective security, peace-keeping, arms control, and disarmament; but there should be more. Peace, in essence, refers to non-violent change.

John:

Then peace, deeply understood, is not just one more value but a reaffirmation of all humane values which open the way to our greatest good. The pursuit of peace manifests itself in action--not action for this or that cause, ideology, or pressing concern but intelligent action based on the core values of peace.

Professor Simpson:

Yes, John, the core values of social justice, environmental care, and cultural solidarity were identified in an earlier chapter. These values are fundamental to the pursuit of peace and underlie a Paradigm Three approach to peace-building.

John:

I am not clear about what you mean by peace building. Does peace not arise organically in the absence of violence?

Professor Simpson:

Peace, from within the third paradigm of peace making, is not seen as a solution to global problems such as war, ecological balance, and social injustice. Peace, in this view, represents a way of seeking solutions. The concept of peace is underpinned by the values of social justice, environmental care, and cultural solidarity. These values promote non-violence and a sense of global responsibility that recognizes the interconnections and interrelationships which make up our global society. These values are based on a view of the world which allows us to see ourselves as part of, not apart from, our planet and its inhabitants. In this way, the struggle for peace becomes the responsibility of each one of us; and peace making becomes peace building.

John:

Then an example of peace building would be taking action in support of more egalitarian social structures.

Professor Simpson:

Yes, John.

John:

Peace action then is directed toward a more humane and equitable social order, a social order less characterized by violence and oppression and more in line with the core values of a Paradigm Three approach to peace. That seems clear enough, but what is not clear is how we can build institutional structures in which cultural diversity is respected and reserved while human unity and solidarity are affirmed. How can the equitable sharing of resources exist in an economic framework governed by the maximization of profit? Can order be maintained within a framework of injustice?

Professor Simpson:

Rather than pretend to have neat and ready answers for these questions, John, I would point to what you are doing in asking them. There is an urgent need to question what we previously accepted, to re-interpret our relation to others and to all forms of life. We need to look for new meanings and to explore a new kind of change. We need not shrink from a world in which the shape and direction of the future is unknown--as it always is in its details--and in which the uncertainty of this does not manifest itself in fear and violence.

John:

Now I understand why, in the thesis, it states that peace is not a state we reach but a generality of activity in which we consciously engage. In this sense, we do not have the peace in which the dead rest.

Professor Simpson:

No. It is alive, dynamic, and characterized by wholeness as opposed to fragmentation.

John:

I gather, then, that in your analysis of peace you find that peace is essentially characterized by wholeness and violence is characterized by division. If a peaceful world is marked by an awareness of things and the interconnections between all things, then violence must be marked by fragmentation and alienation.

Professor Simpson:

Yes, John. The world would seem to be, as expressed in the Gaia hypothesis, for example, a living organism with all forms of life part of the organism and internally related. This sense of wholeness underlies a Paradigm Three approach to peace. Peace, in this view, is part of a tendency to harmonious existence that is both in and realized through its pursuit. Thus it becomes one's responsibility to seek peaceful solutions to the problems and divisions that fragment the globe.

John:

Then peace education is about seeking solutions in the spirit of peace, for peace.

Professor Simpson:

Yes, John. In peace education we realize that we do not have all the answers but search for the transforming questions which concern the very survival of the human species as fully human.

John:

How would peace and the nation state be dealt with in a peace education program?

Professor Simpson:

As you know, John, the nation state is divisive and clouds the concept of unitary humanity. However, let me take you back to the introductory quotation in the thesis. In that quotation, the World Commission on Environment and Development commented on that very problem. They pointed out that:

> Until recently the planet was a large world in which human activities and their effects were neatly compartmentalized within nations, within sectors (energy, agriculture, trade) and within broad areas of concern (environmental, economic, social). These compartments have begun to dissolve.... They are not separate crises: an environmental crisis, a developmental crisis, they are all one.[4]

Do we need to abolish the nation state before we solve our problems? Marx thought so; Kant did not; I do not know. Can we address the needs of the poor and oppressed under the present economic system? I have no answer for those questions. But enquiry into the issues which surround them are part of many peace studies and peace education programs. Without that enquiry and continuing attitude of sympathy towards that enquiry, we certainly will not find what really is possible in terms of peace.

John:

That sense of enquiry, then, is at the base of peace education programs.

Professor Simpson:

Yes.

John:

After reading the thesis, I came away with the impression that peace education is persuasion towards pacifism.

Professor Simpson:

Peace education is education for peace. In peace education there must be integration between the means and the ends of the programs. Persuasion is not education but some kind of indoctrination. Pacifism is only one stance towards peace and not beyond question.

John:

In other words the methods, practices, and structure of peace education programs must be peaceful. But not many schools now employ physically violent methods of teaching.

Professor Simpson:

You are tending toward the very limited concept of violence again. Violence comes in many forms, John. It can be as subtle as structuring school programs in such a way that students are forced to conform to ~~and~~ adopt values and assumptions that support a particular and questionable way of viewing the world.

John:

Can you be a little more specific?

Professor Simpson:

Some educators claim that formal schooling is more a vehicle for mass socialization than mass education, if such a phrase is not rather absurd. Schooling, these critics argue, provides the society with graduates who possess socially useful skills. This system and the skills required for its maintenance become more complex as societies evolve. In this way the individual is socialized into the dominant way of viewing the world, which at present is that of advanced industrial culture. However, as was argued in the thesis, there is an urgent need for a different quality and direction of change. Our view of the world and our relation to each other and to nature is responsible for the crisis that our world now faces.

Education for peace, while critical of the model just discussed, advocates serious enquiry into the concepts and practices that create our world view. Peace education involves students and educators in the process of discovering and creating a new reality. This type of education is an activity of drawing out the creative and harmonious energies that are characteristically smothered in apathy and pacification. Peace education is dynamic. Through the process of enquiry, conscientization, and empowerment, it involves students and educators in the creation of a just and peaceful world. To create this world, and to analyze the policies and practices which support the dominant world view, students and educators in peace education programs must develop skills in the art of critical enquiry, enquiry which exposes a multitude of options rather than a prescribed alternative.

John:

All right. I see that peace education, as you conceive it, does not allow the subtle violence of convincing students to adopt particular beliefs. It is more concerned with subjecting beliefs and assumptions to critical analysis.

Professor Simpson:

That is true, John, but there is more. Educators and students in peace education programs take practical steps toward non-violent resolution of conflict in their personal lives as well as developing skills to become more effective participating citizens in democratic societies.

John:

Would you say that peace education is a humanizing process based on a reaffirmation of unifying values, values that promote unity rather than division and, as a result, peace rather than violence?

Professor Simpson:

Yes. Peace education questions the structures of violence in everyday life, individual and collective.

John:

Can you give me an example of how such questioning would take place?

Professor Simpson:

Peace education implies drawing on the students' potential for living peacefully. In many cases, this results in a situation where teachers and students become learners in true dialogue with each other. Students in this process develop the dignity and self-confidence necessary to question their own values and perceptions.

John:

Then peace education has self-knowledge as an essential aim?

Professor Simpson:

Yes, John, and that knowledge is created through finding and creating significant questions. The critical edge of peace education is intended to liberate the intellect and correlate attitudes of feeling life through encouraging individuals to find, articulate, and question their most basic assumptions. Thus knowledge is created which is based on a student's personal understanding and insight and not on a passive reception of someone else's formulation of things. In this way, teachers and students discover alternatives to violent action and are able to transform their own lives from situations of powerlessness or domination by violent power to the creative identification and release of the roots of violence.

John:

This is a radically different conception than what Paulo Freire termed "banking education."

Professor Simpson:

I agree, but what underlies that remark, John?

John:

In some of my classes I think teachers view me as a problem to be programmed. I and other students feel as though we are being encouraged to adopt values which we have had little time to develop or even explore. In many cases, there is not enough time for enquiry or sincere dialogue to take place. We are not encouraged to question these values or assumptions, which are often reinforced through a tacit curriculum. I think we need peace education. Take my friend Bill Baker, for example; he is an intelligent fellow and full of energy. It was Bill's energy that got him into trouble. In elementary school, the teacher assumed that he had a problem controlling Bill, who began to rebel. Soon Bill was classified as "pre-voc" which in this case meant that he was good for nothing more than the vocational route through the school system. Bill is an intelligent person and this classification destroyed his self-confidence and any inspiration that he might have had.

Professor Simpson:

When schools become involved in sorting students into social categories (classes), the status quo is perpetuated and the divisiveness of violence strengthened. The evidence is overwhelming: humanity is confronting disaster on many fronts and the status quo therefore needs to be questioned, not perpetuated. If what happened to your friend Bill happens to other students, then some schools perpetuate structural violence through their organizational practices.

John:

That view of the formal schooling system is held by many critics of "educational" policies and practices.

Professor Simpson:

Why do the critics hold such views, John?

John:

Critics claim that formal schooling has mistakenly shaped itself into the institution for the mass socialization of students into the dominant social order, a social order that should be called into question. It is the dominant social order (national and global) which has created the problems now threatening our survival. This process, the critics point out, is training for pacification. Peace education is education—it is for emancipation.

Professor Simpson:

Those are very important points needing consideration, John, and I am sympathetic to their concerns. However, you must not fall into the trap of considering peace education to be a package that can be substituted as an alternative value and pursued with the zeal of propaganda and transmitted through authoritarian and manipulative methods. Practices such as those would simply reinforce the passive role of the learner and would be contradictory. Authoritarian and manipulative methods are intrinsically violent in themselves. They necessarily create division and alienation and negate the critical self-development of the learner.

The form of peace education is at least as important as the content. The contradiction that arises when we conceive of unpeaceful methods to deal with peace-oriented topics is predictably ruinous in practice. For example, we create conflictual reactions in students. Peace education then becomes another disconnected abstraction on an overcrowded syllabus which values examination results more than the results in terms of the quality of life engendered.

John:

This dialogue then is an example of education for peace.

Professor Simpson:

Yes, John. As was pointed out in the thesis, education for peace must be consistent in practice so that its processes are also peaceful.

John:

Yes, I see that now. Dialogue, rather than requiring students to master bits of disconnected information, encourages teachers and students to become active participants in the learning process. Conscientization requires dialogue and respects the differences expressed by students.

Professor Simpson:

What you say is true, but there is more. Ideals must be understood deeply enough to flow into and shape practice. The balance between critical reflection and critical action is as important in building more peaceful classrooms as it is in creating a more peaceful world. The one is, in part, a beginning for the other. There is a definite relationship between one's conception of peace, peace education, and peace action.

John:

I am not clear on that relationship. I know it was discussed in the thesis, but I don't feel that I have grasped the significance of the relationship.

Professor Simpson:

It is an important point, John, and one that is worth being clear about. If you recall the actions of peace makers and peace educators in the early part of the twentieth century, you will remember that much of the movement was from the top down. That is, peace makers focused on international agreements and international institutions intended to prevent war. Peace was, at that time, defined as the absence of war. This conception of peace is held by many peace makers and peace educators today, and it has definite implications for how one views peace education. For example, in this view it is assumed that giving students more information about weapons systems, the arms race, and the effects of nuclear war will lead to an awareness of the issues and promote actions leading to a more peaceful world. The objectives are behavioral and the pedagogy is authoritarian.

However, the broader view of peace and education for peace we have been exploring has quite different implications for the curriculum and teaching. In this view, education for peace is seen as an extended process which aims at developing awareness that is more than an increase in knowledge and information--it is, in fact, one that involves a personal transformation in which a new sense of the importance of peace is also an impetus to new kinds of action. Proponents of this view consider violence unacceptable in the relations between individuals as well as among nations. A broad view of peace implies a broad view of violence. As a result, the pedagogical focus is different: "The emphasis is more on the educative mode, in the sense of drawing out or eliciting learning." This focus in learning transforms peace education--as learning about issues of peace and conflict--into education for peace, which implies using peaceful pedagogical practices and evoking understanding rather than using systematic instructions to impart information.

Education for peace calls on us to make some fundamental changes in our value priorities, changes which promote unity with difference rather than division on the basis of difference. These changes embody the recognition and development of a universal human identity as opposed to a world rocked by violent conflict and fragmented by religious, political, national, and other differences. These changes are fundamental to the pursuit of peace; but for a concept such as universal human identity to have any possibility of acceptance we must, at the same time as advocating human unity, value individual and cultural identities. This is a verbal paradox but not a contradiction. It requires nothing less than radical changes in our world views.

John:

Then peace education is critical enquiry into the social reality through a process where both teacher and student become learners in search of and acting for a more harmonious reality.

Professor Simpson:

Yes, John, but you say "enquiry into the social reality." That reality begins within each one of us, in our personal lives wherever we are. Nonetheless, when carried through, it creates our global vision.

John:

The transformation in real, not affected, values implied in your conception of education for peace is far weightier than I had realized. It sounds like an alternative previously pursued by a mere handful of renegade individuals. How, on a large scale, shall we now attain the appropriate depth of understanding to effect such a transformation? This is quite a mind-boggling proposal.

Professor Simpson:

Exactly so. But if we do not try, we certainly will not find out, will we? And to try this, is it not far more intelligent than to shy away from the magnitude of the task?

Chapter VII Endnotes

[1] S. H. Toh, "Neoconservatives and Controversies in Australian Peace Education: Some Critical Reflections and a Counter Strategy," in A Just Peace through Transformation, C. Alger and M. Stohl, Eds. (Boulder: Westview Press, 1988), p. 216.

[2] R. Sperber, "A Superintendent Gives His Reasons for Teaching About Nuclear Issues," Alberta Psychology, 13, Nos. 5 and 6, 1984, p. 5.

[3] J. Dewey, "School as a Means of Developing a Social Consciousness and Social Ideas in Children," Journal of Social Forces, 1, No. 5, pp. 514-517.

[4] World Commission on Environment and Development, Our Common Future (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), p. 3.

Bibliography

Augustine, St. "The City of God." In *Great Political Thinkers*. Ed. W. Ebenstein. Santa Barbara: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969, pp. 176-189.

Augustine, St. *De Civ. Dei, IV*. In J. Kondriela, "Catholic Perspectives on Life in Peace." *Bulletin of Peace Proposals*, 18, No. 3, 1987, pp. 415-432.

Aspin, D. "Peace Studies and Education: A Rejoinder to Scruton." *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 17, No. 1, 1987, pp. 12-19.

Bacchus, K. "The Concept of Global Education." *ATA Magazine*, May/June, 1989, pp. 19-22.

Berryman, P. *Liberation Theology*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1987.

Block, D. "The Impact upon Children and the Family: What Do We Tell the Kids?" *Alberta Psychology*, 13, Nos. 5 and 6, 1984, pp. 24-25.

Bonpane, P. *Guerillas of Peace*. Boston: South End Books, 1985.

Brock, P. *Pacifism in the United States*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968.

Brouwer, W. "Peace Education." *Alberta Science Education Journal*, 22, No. 2, 1988, pp. 17-22.

Bryans, M. "Peace Education: Telling Jack and Jill the Facts of Life." *Peace and Security*, 1, No. 4, 1986-87, p. 6.

Burns, R. "Knowledge for Peace Education." *The Bulletin of Peace Proposals*, V, No. 2, 1981, pp. 115-122.

Capra, F. *The Turning Point*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1983.

Cardenal, E. "Revolution and Peace: The Nicaraguan Road." *Journal of Peace Research*, XVIII, No. 2, 1981, pp. 201-207.

Carson, T. R., and Brouwer, W. *Dimensions of Peace Education*. Curriculum Praxis. Edmonton: Publication Services, Department of Secondary Education, University of Alberta, Occasional Paper No. 39, 1985.

Code, D. "Is Canada Becoming Militarized?" In *Perspectives on Peace and Security*. Ed. N. Kach. Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1988, pp. 1-5.

Cox, G. *The Ways of Peace*. New York: Paulist Press, 1986.

Crawford, M. "The School and the Social Order." In *Essays on Canadian Education*. Eds. N. Kach, K. Mazurek, R. Patterson, and I. De Faveri. Calgary: Detselig, 1982.

De Benedetti, C. Origins of the Modern American Peace Movement, 1919-1929. Millwood, N.Y.: KLO, 1978.

De Benedetti, C. The Peace Reform in American History. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1980.

Dewey, J. "School as a Means of Developing a Social Consciousness and Social Ideas in Children." The Journal of Social Forces, 1, No. 5, 1923, pp. 514-517.

Falk, R. "Document: Openings for Peace and Justice in a World of Danger and Struggle." Alternatives: A Journal of World Policy, XIII, 1988, pp. 140-152.

Fern, D. W. Third World Liberation Theologies. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1986.

Fisher, S., and Hicks, D. World Studies 8-13: A Teacher's Handbook. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1985.

Freire, P. Pedagogy of the Oppressed. Trans. M. B. Ramos. New York: Continuum, 1987.

Galtung, J. "Twenty-Five Years of Peace Research: Ten Challenges and Some Responses." Journal of Peace Research, 22, No. 2, 1985, pp. 141-158.

Gandhi, M. K. Non-Violent Resistance Satyagraha. New York: Schocken Books, 1951. Cited in G. Cox, The Ways of Peace. New York: Paulist Press, 1986, p. 155.

Genovesi, V. J. "The Just War Doctrine: A Warrant for Resistance." The Thomist, 45, No. 3, 1981, pp. 503-539.

Grant, J. Cited in S. H. Toh, "Survival and Solidarity: Australia and Third World (South) Peace." Social Alternatives, 6, No. 2, 1987, pp. 59-65.

Green, T. L. "Organic Farming in India." Alternatives: Perspectives on Society, Technology and Environment, 15, No. 1, 1987, pp. 4-12.

Gutierrez, G. The Power of the Poor in History. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1983.

Gutierrez, G. A Theology of Liberation. Marknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1973.

Harris, I. M. Peace Education. Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland & Company Inc., 1988.

Harris, M. The Rise of Anthropological Theory. New York: Norton, 1968.

Hayes, D. et al. Earth Day—The Beginning. New York: Arno Press, 1970.

Heater, D. Peace Through Education. London: The Falmer Press, 1984.

Hicks, D. "Education for Peace: Principles into Practice." Cambridge Journal of Education, 17, No. 1, 1987, pp. 3-12.

Hicks, D. Education for Peace: What Does It Mean? Lancaster: Occasional Paper No. 1, Center for Peace Studies, 1982.

Hinsley, F. H. Power and the Pursuit of Peace. Cambridge, Massachusetts: University Press, 1963.

Jacobs, Pat. Operation Peace Studies. Melbourne: Rosa Research & Publications, 1985.

Kamanha, K. The Portable Karl Marx. Hammondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1983.

Kant, I. "Perpetual Peace." In On History. Trans. L. W. Beck, R. E. Anchor, and E. L. Fackenheim. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1963.

Kondrilla, J. "The Social Dimensions of Preparation for Peace." Dialectics and Humanism, IX, No. 4, 1982, pp. 47-54.

Lacey, R., Heffernan, C., and Hutchinson, F. Educating for Peace. Canberra, Australia: Canberra Publishing and Printing Co., 1987.

Lagos, G. "The Revolution of Being." In The Creation of a Just World Order. Ed. S. H. Mendlovitz. New York: The Free Press, 1975.

Lakeland, P. "Process and Revolution." Process Studies, 15, No. 4, 1982, pp. 265-273.

Lange, D. "Why New Zealand Wants to be Nuclear Free?" Toronto Star, Jan. 10, 1986, p. A13.

Livesay, D. "Day and Night." In An Anthology of Canadian Literature in English. Eds. D. Bennett and R. Brown. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1983, pp. 512-516.

Maley, W. Peace Studies: A Conceptual and Practical Critique. Canberra: Peace Research Center Working Papers, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University, 1986.

Martin, R. "The Limits of the Peace Movement." Our Generation, 17, No. 2, 1987, pp. 16-24.

Melman, S. Profits Without Production. New York: Knopf, 1983.

Mitchell, J. "Have We Resigned Ourselves to Nuclear Annihilation?" Alberta Psychology, 13, Nos. 5 and 6, 1984, pp. 2-3.

Myers, N., Ed. "Crisis: The Threat of War." *Gaia: An Atlas of Planet Management.* Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1984.

Naidu, M. V. "Meagre Support for Peace Studies." *Peace*, V, No. 3, 1989, p. 27.

Osborne, K. "Peace Education and the Schools: What Can We Learn from History?" *Peace Education and the Task For Peace Educators.* Eds. T. R. Carson and H. Gideonese. NP: World Council for Curriculum and Instruction, 1987, pp. 10-24.

Patterson, N. J. "Peace Education: The Case Against." *Pugwash Papers*, Spring, 1988, p. 10.

Patterson, R. S. "Educational Reform in Western Canada." In *Education in Canada: An Interpretation.* Eds. E. B. Titley and F. Miller. Calgary: Detselig, 1982.

Pickering, M. "Environmental and Native Rights Groups Want World Bank Reform." *Alternatives: Perspectives on Society, Technology and Environment.* 14, No. 3, 1986, pp. 72-75.

Plato. *Plato's Republic*. Trans. G. M. A. Grube. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 1986.

Pradhan, R. C. "Education for Peace and Human Rights: Search for an Indian Perspective. *Gandhi Marg 6*, Nos. 4 and 5, 1984. Cited in G. Cox, *The Ways of Peace*. New York: Paulist Press, 1986, p. 273.

Pushon, J. *Portrait in Grey*. London: Quaker Home Service Friends House, 1984.

Reardon, B. *Comprehensive Peace Education.* New York: Teachers' College Press, 1988.

Reardon, B. A., Ed. *Educating for Global Responsibility*. New York: Teachers' College Press, 1988.

Rotblat, J. "Peace and Disarmament." *Bulletin of Peace Proposals*, 18, No. 3, 1987, pp. 243-259.

R.T.V. "Friends." *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 1983, pp. 743-745.

Scott, P. D. "Towards a Transpolitics: The Role of the Peace Educator." In *Peace Education and the Task of the Peace Educator*. Eds. T. R. Carson and H. D. Gideonese. NP: World Council for Curriculum and Instruction, 1987, pp. 90-105.

Scruton, R. *Education or Indoctrination?* London: Alliance Publishers, 1985.

Selby, D. "World Studies: Towards a Global Perspective in the School Curriculum." *Briefings*, 37, 1984, pp. 1-111.

Siward, R. L. World Military Expenditures 1987-1988. Washington, D.C.: World Priorities, 1987.

Spencer, R. "A Superintendent Gives His Reasons for Teaching About Nuclear Issues." Alberta Psychology, 13, Nos. 5 and 6, 1984, pp. 26-27.

Solie, D. "God and the Bomb—Religious Dimensions of the New Peace Movement." Dialectics and Humanism, IX, No. 4, 1982, pp. 15-27.

Sterba, J. P. "Between MAD and Counter Force: Sound Nuclear Defence Policy." Social Theory and Practice, 12, No. 2, 1987, pp. 172-181.

Taylor, A. M. "Societal Transformation From Paleolithic to Contemporary Times." Philosophy Forum, 15, 1977, pp. 323-398.

Tindall, G. E. America, Vol. 1. New York: Norton, 1984.

Tindall, G. E. America, Vol. 2. New York: Norton, 1984.

Toh, S. H. "Neo-Conservatives and Controversies in Australian Peace Education: Some Critical Reflections and a Common Strategy." In A Just Peace Through Transformation. Eds. C. Alger and M. Stohl. Boulder: Westview Press, 1988.

Toh, S. H. "Flowing Water Over Stones: Themes for Peaceful Pedagogies." Perspectives on Peace and Security. Eds. N. Kach, I. De Faveri, and J. Cloutier. Edmonton: Occasional Paper 88-1, Department of Educational Foundations, University of Alberta, 1988, pp. 33-47.

Toh, S. H. and Floresca-Cawagas, V. Peace Education: A Framework for the Philippines. Quezon City: Phoenix Publishing House, 1987.

Trainer, F. E. Abandon Affluence. 2nd ed. London: Zed Books, 1985.

Walzer, M. Just and Unjust Wars. New York: Basic Books, 1977.

White, R. G., and Hopkins, C. H. The Social Gospel. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1976.

Wien, J. B. Peace and World Order Studies. 4th ed. New York: World Policy Institute, ND.

Wilbur, C. K. "First Latin American Encounter of Christians for Socialism." In The Political Economy of Underdevelopment. Ed. C. K. Wilber. New York: Random House Books, 1979.

Wilson, S. "Breathing Life into the Curriculum." In Towards a Renaissance of Humanity. Ed. T. R. Carson. Edmonton: University of Alberta Printing Services, 1988, pp. 153-168.

Winks, R. V. "Underground Railroad." The Canadian Encyclopedia. Edmonton: Hurtig, 1985, p. 3.

Witvliet, T. A Place in the Sun. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1984.

Woodcock, G. 100 Great Canadians. Edmonton: Hurtig, 1980.

World Commission on Environment and Development. Our Common Future. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.

Worrall, A. J. Quakers in the Colonial Northeast. Hanover, N.H.: University Press of New England, 1980.

Young, N. "Educating the Peace Educators." Bulletin of Peace Proposals, 12, No. 2, 1981, pp. 123-135.

Young, N. "The Peace Movement: Peace Research, Peace Education and Peace Building." Bulletin of Peace Proposals, 18, No. 3, 1987, pp. 331-349.

APPENDIX 1

From: Fisher and Hicks, World Studies 8-13: A Teacher's Handbook (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1985), pp. 121-122.

Native American voices

Here are some of the things said by or to Native Americans when they were fighting to protect their lands in the nineteenth century.

No white person or persons shall be permitted to settle upon or occupy any portion of the territory, or without consent of the Indians to pass through the same.

Treaty of 1868

The whites were always trying to make the Indians give up their life and live like white men – go farming, work hard and do as they did – and the Indians did not know how to do that, and did not want to anyway . . . If the Indians had tried to make the whites live like them, the whites would have resisted, and it was the same way with many Indians.

Wamditanka (Big Eagle) of the Santee Sioux

I have heard that you intend to settle us on a reservation near the mountains. I don't want to settle. I love to roam over the prairies. There I feel free and happy, but when we settle down we grow pale and die. I have laid aside my lance, bow, and shield, and yet I feel safe in your presence. I have told you the truth. I have no little lies hid about me, but I don't know how it is with the commissioners. Are they as clear as I am? A long time ago this land belonged to our fathers; but when I go to the river I see camps of soldiers on the banks. These soldiers cut down my timber; they kill my buffalo; and when I see that, my heart feels like bursting; I feel sorry . . . Has the white man become a child that he should recklessly kill and not eat? When the red men slay game, they do so that they may live and not starve.

Santana, Chief of the Kiowas

We have been south and suffered a great deal there. Many have died of disease which we have no name for. Our hearts looked and longed for this country where we were born. There are only a few of us left, and we only wanted a little ground where we could live. We left our lodges standing and ran away in the night. The troops followed us. I rode out and told the troops that we did not want to fight; we only wanted to go north, and if they would let us alone we would kill no one. The only reply we got was a volley. After that we had to fight our way, but we killed no one who did not fire at us first. My brother, Dull Knife, took one-half of the band and surrendered near Fort Robinson . . . They gave up their guns and then the whites killed them all.

Ohcumgache (Little Wolf) of the Northern Cheyennes

The trail of tears

In 1838 and 1839 laws were passed by the white American government taking away all the Cherokee lands. The army was then sent to round up all the Cherokee men, women and children at gunpoint. Those who resisted were killed.

In the autumn of 1838 12,000 Cherokee were forced to march west away from their land to Oklahoma. 4,000 of them died on the march. Eyewitness accounts of this still exist. Here is a description by Private John Burnett who was one of the soldiers taking part. He called it his 'Birthday Story', and addressed it to his sons and grandsons.

Children:

This is my birthday December the 11th 1890, I am eighty years old today . . . The removal of the Cherokee Indians from their life long homes in the year of 1838 found me a young man in the prime of life and a private soldier in the American Army . . . I saw the helpless Cherokees arrested and dragged from their homes, and driven at bayonet point into the stockades. And in the chill of the drizzling rain on an October morning I saw them loaded like cattle or sheep into 645 wagons and started towards the west.

One can never forget the sadness and solemnity of that morning. Chief John Ross led in prayer and when the bugle sounded and the wagons started rolling many of the children rose to their feet and waved their hands goodbye to their mountain homes, knowing they were leaving them forever. Many of these helpless people did not have blankets and many of them had been driven from home barefooted.

On the morning of November 7th we encountered a terrific sleet and snow storm with freezing temperatures and from that day until we reached the end of the fateful journey . . . the sufferings of the Cherokees were awful. The trail of the exiles was a trail of death. They had to sleep in the wagons and on the ground without fire. And I have known as many as twenty-two of them die in one night of pneumonia due to ill treatment, cold and exposure . . .

At this time in 1890 we are too near the removal of the Cherokee for our young people to fully understand the enormity of the crime that was committed against a helpless race, truth is the facts are being concealed from the young people of today . . .

. . . Murder is murder whether committed by the villain skulking in the dark or by uniformed men stepping to the strains of martial music. Murder is murder and somebody must answer, somebody must explain the streams of blood that flowed in the Indian country in the summer of 1838. Somebody must explain the 4,000 silent graves that mark the trail of the Cherokee to their exile. I wish I could forget it all, but the picture of 645 wagons lumbering over the frozen ground with their cargo of suffering humanity still lingers in my memory.

Let the historian of a future day tell the sad story with its sighs its tears and dying groans. Let the great Judge of all the earth weigh our actions and reward us accordingly to our work.

Children – thus ends my promised birthday story. This December the 11th 1890.

APPENDIX 2

From: Perspectives on Peace and Security,
eds. N. Kach, I. De Faveri, and J.
Cloutier (Edmonton:
University of Alberta,
1988), pp. 52-76.

Overview

The unit consists of five sessions. It begins with stories that describe the situation in which some South African and Palestinian teenagers find themselves. The stories become a tool to initiate discussion around questions of human rights. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights is introduced into the discussion and provides the focus for the balance of session one.

Sessions two, three, and four explore the problems faced by the Cree people of Lubicon Lake. These problems forced the Lubicon Band to file a formal complaint with the United Nations Human Rights Committee charging Canada, among other things, with denying the Band the right of basic subsistence. These sessions utilize storytelling and role play to examine the issues which led to the Lubicon Band's allegations.

In session two, students tell The Lubicon Story through several characters: a reporter, a medical doctor, a church worker, a representative of the Canadian government, and members of the Lubicon Band. The story is followed by discussion and analysis and the session concludes with class members brainstorming possible solutions to the Lubicon problem.

The group in session three, look at the Lubicon situation through a series of snapshot stories. Snapshot stories are a series of frozen pictures in which students illustrate key events from The Lubicon Story. These stories enable students to examine causes, look for points where change could have taken place, and project possible futures.

In session four, students form a United Nations Human Rights Committee. The committee then considers submissions by other members of the class who represent the government of Canada and the Lubicon Band. After considering submissions from both groups, committee members rule on the admissibility of the Lubicon claim. In session five, students brainstorm ways in which they can take action in support of a solution to the Lubicon problem.

Grade Level

This unit is suitable for Junior and Senior High School, grades 8-12.

UNDERSTANDING HUMAN RIGHTS THROUGH ROLE PLAY

Joe Cloutier
Department of Educational Foundations
University of Alberta

Consultants: Colleen Stepney, Social Studies Teacher
J.J. Bowlen, Catholic Junior High School
Lorna Thomas, Educator and Drama Consultant.

Table of Contents

Introduction 52
Overview 53
Session 1 54
"Girls Apart" 55
"Keeping the peace" 57
United Nations Backgrounder 58
Session 2 61
The Lubicon Story 62
Session 3 70
Session 4 73
Session 5 75

Introduction

Respect for human rights must occupy a central place in any peaceful society. But how are we to make sense of the conflicting claims that often occur when human rights violations are alleged and just as quickly denied? This unit--Understanding Human Rights Through Role Play--explores some of the ways that an understanding of, and action for, human rights are possible.

Storytelling and role play enable students to become actively engaged in the learning process. Learning then takes place through the students' personal discoveries, efforts, and insights. Students experience other points of view and become personally involved in the issues under study. The natural vitality which grows out of personal involvement can then be focused into detailed discussion and analysis. This process is empowering and leads to action for human rights.

SESSION 1

Intention: To enable students to:

- identify human rights violations on a global, local and personal level through storytelling and reflection on personal experience
- explain the origins of the United Nations and the role it plays in protecting human rights
- name and explain two types of human rights
- identify current examples of human rights violations

Resources:

- Stories
  - "Keeping the Peace"
  - "Girls Apart"
- "United Nations Backgrounder"
- International Bill of Human Rights

Activities:

1. Select three students to read the stories "Girls Apart" and "Keeping the Peace"
2. In groups of four have students:
   - define the term human rights
   - identify human rights violations from the stories or from their personal experience
   - sharing definitions and violations
3. Brainstorm with students
   - state examples of human rights violations that have occurred in the last 300 years
   - identify problems regarding human rights that arise in wartime?
   - discuss the possibility of a conflict between security and liberty?
4. Read the "United Nations Backgrounder"
   - discuss origins and development of United Nations
   - discuss United Nations role in protecting human rights
5. Read selections from the Universal Declaration and the International Covenants
   - Questions to illustrate different types of rights
     - are some human rights more basic than others?
     - what is a legal right?
     - what is a moral right?
     - what are liberty-oriented rights?
     - what are security-oriented rights?

6. Question students
   - if you were the government of a country that signed the declaration and ratified the Covenants, what responsibilities would you have?
7. Students respond in writing to the following:
   - Describe a violation of human rights that you are aware of. Your example could come from literature, poetry, movies, television, rock videos, or your own personal experience

Follow-up: In Session 2 we will look at a situation in which some people in Alberta--the Cree People from Lubicon Lake--have filed a formal complaint with the United Nations Human Rights Committee. In the complaint they state that the government of Canada is violating their basic human rights as set out in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

Girls Apart

The following story is taken from a review of the movie Girls Apart. In the movie two 16-year old girls from South Africa, Sylvia, who is black, and Sisca, who is white, tell us about their life. But before we hear their story, a bit of history:

The death of a 12-year old schoolboy marked the start of Soweto's 1976 uprising. Since then South Africa's black school children have stepped into the front line of the fight against apartheid. An estimated 10,000 have been arrested and detained under the most recent State of Emergency declared in June 1986. Meanwhile, more than 30,000 white school-leavers are conscripted each year into the army which helps to police South Africa's black townships. Inside or outside their classrooms South Africa's children are being schooled for war.

Sylvia says, "Black people won't fight against whites, but they are going to fight against the police who are killing the people," while Sisca claims, "No-one (sic) has any reason to say that apartheid still exists between black and white in South Africa."

Girls Apart is the story of two 16-year old schoolgirls, one black, one white. Sylvia lives in Soweto, the sprawling black 'township' of more than a million people which services the neighbouring white city. Sisca lives just 15 miles away in one of Johannesburg's exclusively-white suburbs.

Sisca and Sylvia have never met. Nor, under the present system, are they likely to. Their worlds, like their views of the world, are poles apart. Yet each comes from a family which, within its own community, would be considered politically moderate. Sylvia, a student activist, has been arrested--and tortured--by the police. But still she rejects violence and believes in negotiation with the white government. Sisca's family members are lifelong supporters of that government, but see themselves as 'verligte', or enlightened, in their acceptance of the need for reform.

Sylvia and Sisca are the presenters of Girls Apart, taking turns to put their contrasting views of their country. Both believe that foreigners have a 'distorted view of how it really is in South Africa'. And each, in her own way, wants to put the record straight.

Each of them takes us on a guided tour of the South Africa she knows, introducing us to her home and family and so to her community and its way of life.

While Sylvia tells the story of her detention and torture, Sisca justifies her lack of interest in politics. Each offers a definition of apartheid, and tells us how she would feel if her brother were to marry across racial lines.

Finally, Sisca and Sylvia explain why each of them believes she must fight for the future she wants; inevitably, it seems, against the other. Sisca argues that white schoolboys must learn 'to kill and be killed' in defence of the system they value, while Sylvia, at the graveside of a young comrade murdered by vigilantes, declares simply that 'Botha must die'. (New Internationalist No. 182, Afterward)

Keeping The Peace

by Richard Butchins

Khalil Said Khahil, aged 14, was buying food in a shop when someone threw a stone at an Israeli patrol in Jabaliaya, Gaza.

Moments later he was being dragged unconscious along the street with blood flowing from his head, being kicked and beaten by Israeli soldiers. His crime: having come out of the shop at the wrong moment.

Khalil's case is typical of the treatment many youngsters received at the hands of the occupation forces. Most are arrested for suspected 'Hostile Terrorist Acts'. Current laws empower the security forces to arrest anyone of any age for writing slogans on walls, singing nationalist songs, possessing literature with a nationalist content, making a 'V' for victory sign, displaying the colours of the Palestinian flag, throwing stones, burning tyres, building a barricade--or even wearing a piece of Palestinian jewellery.

Children may be arrested anywhere--in the classroom or in the home, without warrant--and tried in an Israeli military court. These courts take the view that anyone aged 14 or over must be treated as an adult. The average sentence for throwing stones is between four and six months.

After arrests the suspect is held incommunicado for 18 days and prohibited from contacting parents or an attorney. After 14 days they may contact the Red Cross. Children as young as nine or 10 have been detained during sweeps and held for days during which time they are threatened, intimidated and abused into giving information about others.

The use of torture to extract confessions from persons suspected of Hostile Terrorist Acts is routine, the Landua Commission investigating Israel's Shin Bet secret police recently established. Methods used include electric shocks, burning of flesh with cigarettes and tying sacks soaked in water, urine or excrement over their heads.

The arrest, imprisonment and torture of juveniles in the occupied territories is clearly a political, not a security, measure. And up till now, the unarmed children of the Occupied Territories have not been a match for Israel's well-equipped combat squads. (1988:276)

United Nations Backgrounder

The United Nations

After the horror and destruction of two world wars and the extermination of millions of Jews in Nazi concentration camps, the United Nations--an international organization dedicated to working towards a better and more peaceful future--was formed. The United Nations Charter, a document defining the purposes, methods and structure of the organization, was signed by representatives of fifty nations in 1945.

The United Nations Human Rights Commission

In 1948 the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations as a common standard of hope and achievement for the people of all nations. The Declaration is not a law; it is a standard to work towards. It states that people everywhere should be able to live in freedom and peace. The Declaration has three parts: Part One is the preamble or introduction and it lists seven reasons for making the statement to the world; Part Two is the Proclamation and states the sense and hope of the declaration; Part Three lists the thirty Articles or statements which are the goal of the Declaration.

The International Covenants on Human Rights

On December 16, 1966, the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights were voted upon and adopted by the United Nations General Assembly. The two Covenants and the Universal Declaration make up the International Bill of Rights. The two Covenants become legally binding on states who ratify them (formally approve and sign). This step was taken by the government of Canada, with the unanimous consent of the provinces, in 1976. Every individual in Canada now has the right to complain to the Human Rights Committee if a Canadian government is not meeting Covenant requirements.

The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

Liberty-oriented rights are sometimes referred to as civil and political rights. They limit the actions of government and give individuals as much control over their lives as possible. These include: the right to express our opinions freely and the right to life, liberty, and security from unlawful violence.

Supervision of these rights takes place through the United Nations Human Rights Committee. The committee examines reports describing how the Covenant is being implemented; it can consider complaints by one state against another providing both states recognize the committee's right to do so; and the Committee can consider complaints from individual citizens of countries that have agreed to this procedure.

The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

This Covenant is seen as a standard to work towards and supervision is limited to a system of reporting by participating states. Signatory states submit reports outlining their progress in the area of economic, social, and cultural rights. Security-oriented rights such as public education or public health care, for example, require government intervention, whereas liberty-oriented rights are set out to provide individuals with as much freedom from state interference as possible. These rights, however, are closely linked and should both be promoted at the same time.

By 1980 most governments in the world had signed their agreement to the Universal Declaration. But all governments had not ratified the Covenants. Governments which sign and ratify the Covenants must make changes in their law to agree with the Covenants. Although the work of the United Nations has advanced the recognition of human rights in the world, there is still much for us all to do.

References

Amnesty International. (1987). Human rights education. British Section.

Butchins, Richard. (1988). "Keeping the peace" The New Internationalist. Human Rights, April, No. 182:26.

Selby, David. (1987). Human rights. London: Cambridge University Press.

Tarnopolsky, Walter S. (1985). Human rights. The Canadian Encyclopedia. Edmonton: Hurtig Publishers, 846.

SESSION 2

Intention: To enable students, through storytelling and role play, to explore some of the problems faced by the Lubicon Band.

Resources: The Lubicon Story

Activities:

1. Select students to read for each character.
2. After the story students form groups to discuss the thoughts and feelings they experienced during the reading.
3. Questions to promote discussion:
    - Who is involved in this situation?
    - What is their problem or conflict?
    - Why is there a problem (what has led to this problem?)?
    - What could be done to change the situation?

Follow-up: Students should record important points of the story for class discussion.

Notes for Teaching:

- Choose people to represent each character.
- If some students are hesitant, indicate that everyone will have an opportunity.
- Students need background information on their characters to help generate interest.
- Help establish important character relationships.
- Reinforce conflicts.
- Establish the space where the role play takes place.
- Everyone must be clear where buildings, doors, etc., are.
- Set the mood and scene for the story to begin.

The Lubicon Story

by Joe Cloutier

Characters: Newspaper Reporter, Medical Doctor, Lubicon Trapper, Church Worker, Four Council Members, Provincial Government Representative, Federal Government Representative, Lubicon Elder.

Imagine that you are a reporter for your local newspaper. You have just been handed your next assignment; it reads:

> A Small isolated band of Cree Indians in northern Alberta, the Lubicon Lake Band, are fighting for their survival as a people. They claim that their culture and social structure are being torn apart.

Find out what is behind this story. Why are they engaged in what they call a "desperate struggle for justice"? And why did they file a complaint with the United Nations Human Rights Commission?

Reporter (to herself): I just noticed an article about the Lubicon Band in the Calgary Herald. The paper should still be in the magazine rack. It is. Now the article, where is it? Let me see... "McKnight states his view of Lubicon land impasse" this is it. Bill McKnight, minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, in a speech to the House of Commons on March 17, 1988 said:

> In the end analysis, the Lubicon Lake band contends that it is not covered by or bound by Treaty 8... The Lubicon Lake band asserts aboriginal title over some 7,000 square miles of northern Alberta and has challenged the present owners of that land--the Province of Alberta--in a legal action that was begun by the band in 1982... It is Canada's view that the Lubicon Lake band is part of Treaty 8. We have offered an interim reserve of 25.4 square miles for the band. The government of Canada is prepared to establish a reserve and negotiate all outstanding issues so that this long-standing grievance can be fairly and honorably settled... I understand that the action or inaction of past governments has given rise to mistrust... [But] if the band wants a negotiated settlement I urge them to set aside preconditions, and

their aboriginal claims cases, and begin direct discussions (March 28, A5)

This is my chance!... Finally I can find out what is really going on up there. Now, where did I put that map? Why would people in Canada need to struggle for justice? Why would Canadian people file a complaint with the United Nations Human Rights Commission? The Whole thing seem absurd.

The map, where is it? Here it is, right where I left it under those old papers. Now, Lubicon Lake... east of Peace River, between the Peace and Athabasca Rivers, near that small settlement--what's the name, oh yes, Little Buffalo. It looks pretty isolated, no roads marked on the map. There must be roads by now! What date is this map anyway? No wonder, 1980. Oh well, I'll drive to Peace River and make my way from there.

Reporter (after driving to Peace River): That breakfast in Peace River was delicious. The people were friendly. I hope these directions to Little Buffalo are correct. Imagine, just a few years ago this road was an old wagon trail. Not many reporters rode wagons into Little Buffalo, I'll bet. Whoops! Looks like some buildings--yes, houses, log cabins, out buildings... that must be Little Buffalo, over there... corrals, tepees, an old school bus, a new trailer. Now that trailer looks out of place. What does that sign say? Clinic! It's a mobile clinic! That will be a good place to start--what is it doing here anyway? (Get out of the car and walk to the Clinic door.) KNOCK! KNOCK!

Doctor: Come in, you look healthy enough, what's bothering you?

Reporter: I'm not sick. I'm a reporter.

Doctor: That can be just as bad.

Reporter: What is going on here? Why is this clinic here?

Doctor: T.B.--There's an epidemic here. One person in four is being treated for tuberculosis, never seen anything like it. People are flown to the hospital in Edmonton in groups. It strikes the kids and the old folks first. I see 100 tuberculosis victims a week. It's a good thing we have antibiotics to help control the disease. Every week they drag themselves in here for their shot.

Reporter: How did this happen? What's gone wrong?

Doctor: Overcrowding; on the average four people sleep in one room--when one person is infected they all get it. The people are not very healthy. They are all underweight. The weight problem is part of their general health problem, which is a direct result of the change in their diet, a change from a diet enriched with moose meat and berries to one fortified by macaroni and baloney. The other factor is stress, brought about by the change in their lives. Put all those factors together and you have a very unhealthy situation.

Reporter: Why? Why is this happening?

Doctor: Look, maybe you should go and talk to some of the Lubicon people.

Reporter (leaves the clinic and walks into the settlement, approaches a man leaning against a log cabin): Hello, can I ask you a few questions?

Lubicon Trapper: What kind of questions?

Reporter: The doctor in the clinic was telling me about some of the factors that are contributing to your problems. Would you care to give me your point of view?

Lubicon Trapper: Oil is the main one. The damn machines destroy (cough, cough) our trap lines, scare away the animals, now there are none left. In the old days--ten years ago the community had between 200-250 moose to eat, last year we shared 3 among 450 people. Our way of life is dying. Roads are bulldozed through our hunting grounds. We receive no satisfaction in the courts, we don't know where to turn. Some people are drinking, a little while ago we had our first suicide. I just don't know what to do. (cough, cough)

Reporter: Who discovered the oil? I thought this land was your traditional home.

Lubicon Trapper: The Alberta Government gave out what they call oil leases to the oil companies. These leases give the companies the right to build roads through the bush, to destroy our traplines and to exploit our land and resources. We were promised a reserve in 1939 and we are still waiting. Our community is falling apart. Our youth--the hope of our people--drowning in alcohol. When I take my son out on the trapline like my father did with me, we find the traps bulldozed, we find traps set off with sticks, we find bulldozers cutting roads through the bush, we find no trespassing signs on gates, and the gates block the new roads through our traditional lands. What do I have left to pass on to my son? (cough, cough, cough) He sees me as a failure. I can't show him how to trap or hunt--there are no animals left. We can't feed ourselves. I collect welfare and stare at the forest that once supported our people. My youngest daughter is sick, I cough all the time, my son is always drinking--sometimes he sleeps in town on the sidewalk. My wife and I... sometimes we fight. Once I got drunk and beat her up... When a man can't trap or hunt he can't support his family--he's a failure. What can I teach my son? I... I don't want to talk any more. Please talk to someone else.

<ins>Reporter</ins>: Who?

<ins>Lubicon Trapper</ins>: Church people--they come here to help us--talk to them. Just wander around until you see someone.

<ins>Reporter</ins>: I am sorry to upset you... sorry. That must be a church worker there. (Walking towards the worker.) Excuse me, could I talk with you?

<ins>Church Worker</ins>: Yes, but you'll have to be quick--there is much to be done.

<ins>Reporter</ins>: Why are you here? What brought you to this isolated community?

<ins>Church Worker</ins>: The issue is very complex, but for me it's very simple: I am concerned that 90% of the Lubicon People are on welfare.

I am concerned that 20% of their people are infected with tuberculosis.

I am concerned that their traditional way of life is being destroyed and that the hope of their youth is slipping into alcohol and depression.

These are simple issues: food, shelter, clothing, culture, tradition, dignity and hope. These are basic human rights that people have been struggling with for centuries. I must go now--there's a band meeting just beginning, someone will talk to you at the meeting. Just walk into that building over there.

Reporter: What luck--a band meeting. (Walk to the building, knock on the door.)

First Council Member: Who is it?

Reporter: I am a reporter, could I talk to you? (Four council members and two politicians sitting around a table.)

First Council Member: Sure, come in and sit down. What would like to know?

Reporter: How did all this happen?

First Council Member: It happened because we are so isolated. In 1899 government officials--the Treaty 8 Party--traveled up the Peace and Athabasca Rivers making treaties with Indian bands in the area. Our people were missed by the treaty-makers. Because of this we never signed a treaty, we never gave up title to our lands and we did not enter into any agreement with the government. We retained sovereignty over our lands. But in 1939 we were finally visited by federal government officials who at that time promised us a reserve. Instead of a reserve Indian affairs officials began removing Lubicon people from official band lists. World War II came and again we were left alone until the 1970's. Then, the oil rush.

In 1978 the government of Alberta completed an all-weather road into our territory. Oil companies were granted leases to explore and exploit our traditional lands. Then, more roads, bulldozers, oil workers, oil rigs, fences, dynamite, forest fires--the environment we depended on destroyed. The wildlife, our dignity, our pride--all gone... Now we have alcohol and welfare. The Alberta government and major oil companies make millions of dollars from the resources on our land.

Reporter: Why didn't you stop it sooner--go to court--appeal to the people?

Second Council Member: We did that. In 1975 we filed a caveat on our lands hoping to halt further development until a settlement was reached. In 1980 we began legal action against both the federal and provincial governments and the major oil companies working on our land. In 1984 we filed a complaint with the United Nations Human Rights Commission. In 1987 we toured Europe with the intention of drawing international attention to our problem. In 1988 we boycotted the Calgary Winter Olympics. Still, after all that, our situation gets worse every day.

Reporter: I have a long list of questions, but let's go back to 1975. Why would you file a caveat? What is that, anyway?

Third Council Member: A caveat is a warning, a statement of interest. It was put on our land to protect it--to save the land from development until our claim was settled.

Reporter: What happened then?

Third Council Member: The Alberta Government passed retroactive legislation making it impossible for anyone to file a caveat on our land.

Reporter: Retroactive! Do you mean they passed a law that was back dated?

Third Council Member: Yes. Bill 29 they called it.

Reporter: That sounds unusual.

Fourth Council Member: Many people thought so. Pierre Burton, for example, as director of the Canadian Civil Liberties Association, spoke out against the law at a public meeting in Edmonton. John McLaren, dean of the University of Calgary Law School, said the law discriminated against native people. But nothing worked; we were stalled in the courts. The wheels of justice move slowly and while we wait our culture is being destroyed. We are unable to reach a just settlement in the Canadian courts. But now, this could be the last straw: the provincial government with the support of the federal government have leased all but 25 square miles of our traditional territory to Daishowa, a Japanese pulp and paper company. The lease involves the logging of large tracts of our traditional territory. The federal government granted 9.5 million dollars to the project and the province will spend 65 million dollars towards the Daishowa project.

Provincial Government Representative: I must speak out. The provincial government represents all the people of Alberta, not just those at Lubicon Lake. It is our responsibility, as elected representatives, to protect the rights of all the people of this great province. We need the oil deposits in this area. This is a depressed area--we need jobs. The pulp mill will create over one thousand jobs. Much of the paper will be shipped to Japan and it will not impact on the domestic market. I agree, the legal process is slow, but our responsibility is to protect the rights of all Albertans. That is why they elected us. We have tried to negotiate with the Lubicon people but they refuse to cooperate. We have set aside 25 square miles for a reserve but they want much more. We have no choice but to proceed with development for the benefit of all Albertans. I hope we can come to a settlement soon.

Lubicon Elder: But our people lived on this land before the white men came. We have always lived with the land and its creatures. We shared its bounty and we felt no need to own it. The idea was strange to us. We still don't understand how you can own the land. The Great Spirit gave us the land to use and to care for. But you want to own the land and then you destroy it--we just don't understand.

Federal Government Representative: Canada's native people are a federal responsibility but the land in question is owned by the government of Alberta. It is the provincial government who must transfer the land to the federal government. They are not prepared to transfer the amount of land that the Lubicon Band are claiming as their traditional territory. The courts will have to settle the issue.

Lubicon Elder: While we wait for the courts our way of life is being destroyed...

References

Barnes, Karren, & Thomas, Lorna. (1985).. Kids at work. Legal Resource Center of Alberta.

Fulton, Hon. E.D. (1986). Fulton discussion paper. Commissioned by David Crombie, Federal Minister of Indian Affairs.

McKnight, Bill, (1988). "McKnight states his view of Lubicon Land impasse" edited text of a speech to the House of Commons, Calgary Herald. March 17, A5.

Provincial land offer for Lubicon Reserve: The facts. (1985). Statement my Milt Pahl, Minister Responsible for Native Affairs, Alberta Native Affairs.

Smith, Donald, (1988, March 1). Alberta Cree victims of callous disregard. The Toronto Star.

Smith, James G.E. (1987). Canada--The Lubicon Lake Cree. Cultural Survival Quarterly, 11(3), 61-62.

Sunday Morning. Radio Program. (October 11, 1987). Transcript. David McLauchlin, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

World Council of Churches. (1983). Program to Combat racism. Statement to the Rt. Hon. Pierre Trudeau, Prime Minister of Canada.

SESSION 3

Intention: To have students come to a deeper understanding of the Lubicon situation by using a role-play technique called "snapshot stories" to promote discussion and analysis.

Activities:

1. Review The Lubicon Story.
2. Demonstrate what a "snapshot" is by placing two students in a simple snapshot (e.g., one student "freezes" in the position of someone hunting. The other person kneels below him, watching, as if he is a child observing the parent).
3. Explain that snapshot stories are group-created stories composed with a series of 5-6 frozen pictures. Each group of 5-6 students is presented with a topic (see below) and is responsible for how the topic is presented. The group structures the snapshot story, works together to develop each snapshot, and, through analysis of the characters and situation, creates the snapshot story. Group discussion will follow the showing of each snapshot story.
4. Present the topics which the students will create the stories on:
   - Topic A: The history of the Lubicon situation (1 group)
     - Compose a series of 5-7 snapshots that depict, according to group members, important events that helped create the crisis which confronts the Lubicon people today.
   - Topic B: The history of the Lubicon situation as it might have been (2 groups)
     - Compose 5-7 snapshots that demonstrate alternative action which could have been taken (e.g., by government representatives, by the Lubicon people) that would have resulted in a different scenario today.
   - Topic C: What the future holds for the Lubicon Band (2 groups)
     - Compose snapshots that begin with the crisis of today and project it into a possible future.
   - Note that the snapshot stories either begin or end with a crisis.
5. Students form groups of 4 to 5 and choose or are assigned a topic.
6. Each snapshot story and each individual snapshot should be titled.
   - After the students have been working for a while, inform them that the title of the story will relate to the assigned topic, but the title of each snapshot will depend on how the group creates the story.

7. As the students work, the teacher can move from group to group, posing questions such as:
   - What is the problem?
   - Where does the story take place?
   - Who are the characters in your story?
   - How does each character feel about the conflict?

Questions such as these will help students become involved in their roles.

NOTE: Students may have many characters in their story. They can write their roles on a piece of paper and tape the paper to their chests. In this way the audience is able to identify the different characters in the snapshot and understand what is taking place in the story.

- Each group shares their snapshot story.
  - The audience must be directed to close their eyes while students get into place for each snapshot and open them after the title of each snapshot is given.
  - One member of the group is designated to call out "open" and "close."
- Discussion and analysis should follow each snapshot story
  Questions to initiate discussion:
  - What is happening in the story?
  - What might have happened to cause a different ending?
  - How did you feel when portraying the character?
  - Who "wins" and who "loses" in this story?
  - Where does the power to effect change lie?
  - In this story are the basic human rights of the Lubicon people being violated?
  - How are we linked to the situation (e.g., gas consumption)?
  - How are we linked to the Lubicons?
  - What remedies (legal, political, social) are available to the Lubicon people?

Follow-up: Inform students that in the next session the class will form one large group and two small groups. The large group will represent the United Nations Human Rights Committee and the two smaller ones will represent the Canadian Government and the Lubicon Band.

- Class members will conduct a simulated United Nations Human Rights Committee Hearing.

- Both the group representing the Canadian Government and the group representing the Lubicon Band will make presentations to the committee.
- Submissions should be short and to the point.
- After reflecting on submissions, committee members decide whether the complaint is admissible or not.

Homework: Answer the following question in a short position paper: Have the basic human rights of the Lubicon Band been violated? Support your position with specific examples.

References:

Selman, Jan. Role play. n.d. AADAC.

SESSION 4

Intention:

- To have students identify and analyze a situation in which human rights violations are alleged to have taken place.
- To have students decide whether or not a rights violation has occurred.

Resources: Lubicon Band's complaint to the United Nations Human Rights Committee and the Canadian Government's Response.

Activities:

1. Instruct the groups representing the Federal government and the Lubicon Band to finalize their submissions.
2. Instruct the United Nations Human Rights Committee to prepare for the hearing.
   - Committee members' country of origin should be clearly marked on name cards in front of each member.
3. After hearing both submissions (Federal government and Lubicon Band), the committee discusses the presentations and reaches a decision.
   - Have human rights violations occurred?
   - Under which articles?
   - What are your recommendations?
   - Identify the values behind each position?
   - Consider which position most closely resembles your own.
4. After class presentations and committee recommendations, the official Lubicon Band Complaint to the United Nations Human Rights Committee should be read.
   - The procedure involved in making a submission could be discussed.
     - Individuals or groups must have done everything possible to obtain redress (justice) in their own country.
     - The government concerned is given six months to submit evidence before the case is examined to determine if a human rights violation has occurred.
     - The committee's views are summarized in a press release and are included in its annual report to the General Assembly.
     - It normally takes 2-3 years to deal with a case.
     - Should the committee do more than publish its views?

5. The Federal government's response should be read. Followed by the committee's ruling.

Follow-up: Students should reflect on the previous four sessions and be prepared to take a position during Session 5.

SESSION 5

Intention: To enable students to take positive action in support of human rights.

Activities: Brainstorm action plans with students.

1. Once you are aware of human rights violations, should that awareness lead to action?
2. According to your values, what action will you take?
3. Suggestions to answer the question, what can I do?
   - Write letters to:

     Rt. Hon. Brian Mulroney
     Office of the Prime Minister
     House of Commons
     Ottawa, Ontario
     K1A 0A2

     The Hon. B. McKnight
     Minister, Indian Affairs & Northern Development
     Government of Canada
     Ottawa, Ontario
     K1A 0H4

     The Hon. Don Getty
     Premier of Alberta
     Room 307, Legislature Bldg.
     Edmonton, Alberta
     T5K 2B7

   - Your local M.P. and M.L.A.
   - Church magazines
   - Radio stations
   - Phone-in shows
   - Organize letter-writing campaigns
   - Make and pin up posters illustrating your views

4. Join Human Rights organizations and participate in their work; organizations such as:
   - Amnesty International
   - Tools for Peace
   - Church groups
   - Organize a group in your school

Further Suggestions:

- Evaluation could include presentations, discussion, analysis, position papers and action plans.
- A student journal could include most of the above and be a learning experience for both students and teacher.
- This unit could be taught in cooperation with members of a drama class or the drama department.
- The Lubicon Story could be replaced with a shorter story or fact sheets which will be on file on the Peace Project. The Complaint to the U.N. Human Rights Committee, as well as other resource materials for this unit, will be on file in the office of the Peace Project, Department of Secondary Education, University of Alberta.
- The structure of this unit's five sessions are presented as a suggested format and could be improved by most creative teachers.